DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 880 SE 024 297

AUTHOR	Wiley Karen B.; Race, Jeanne
TITLE	The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955-1975. Volume III: Social Science Education and Appendix.
INSTITUTION	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Science and Mathematics Education.
PUB DATE	77
CONTRACT	NSF-C-7620627
NOTE	514p.; For related documents, see SE 024 292-296; Contains marginal legibility in tables
EDRS PRICE	MF-$1.00 HC-$27.45 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum; *Educational Needs; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Instruction; Reports; Research Reviews (Publications); *Social Sciences; *State of the Art Reviews; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*National Science Foundation

ABSTRACT

This report is based on a survey of the literature on needs and practices in precollege social science education for the period 1955 through 1975. The major task of the study was to identify, analyze, and summarize the literature produced during that two decade period concerning: (1) the state of and trends in practices in precollege social science education; (2) the effectiveness and efficiency in precollege social science education; and (3) the state of and trends in perceptions of needs in precollege social science education. Extensive systematics searches were conducted of the ERIC data base, "Dissertation Abstracts," "Psychological Abstracts," "Sociological Abstracts," "Education Index," all comprehensive reviews of research in social studies education, all compilations of abstracts of dissertations in social studies education, and the journal "Social Education." In addition, special-focus searches were carried out as needed related to various handbooks, encyclopedias, curriculum guides, and state-of-the-art monographs. The report is organized into four sections: (1) Literature Describing the State of and Trends in Social Studies/Social Science Education Practices, 1955-1975; (2) Research on the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Practices in Social Studies/Social Science Education; (3) Needs in Social Studies/Social Science Education; and (4) The "New Social Studies." An appendix containing supporting data is included. (Author/SLH)

****

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

****

ED153880

THE STATUS OF PRE-COLLEGE SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION: 1955 - 1975

VOLUME III: SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stanley Helgeson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Karen B. Wiley

with

Jeanne Race

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado

1977

Supported by Contract NSF-C7620627 from the National Science Foundation to the Center for Science and Mathematics Education, The Ohio State University; Stanley L. Helgeson, Project Director.

SE 024 297

THE STATUS OF PRE-COLLEGE SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION: 1955-1975

VOLUME III: SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

Karen B. Wiley

with

Jeanne Race

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado

1977

Supported by Contract NSF-C7620627 from the National Science Foundation to the Center for Science and Mathematics Education, The Ohio State University; Stanley L. Helgeson, Project Director.

The material in this report is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Contract Number NSF-C7620627. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Table of Contents

Table of Tables iii

Glossary of Initials and Acronyms vi

Introduction. 1

Section 1.0--Literature describing the State of and Trends in Social Studies/Social Science Education Practices, 1955-1975 . . 12

1.1 Introduction 13

1.2 Trends in Social Studies Curriculum Content 21

1.3 State of Instructional and Administrative Practices in Social Studies 48

1.4 The State of Social Studies Curriculum Materials 80

1.5 The State of Social Studies Teacher Education 120

Section 2.0--Research on the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Practices in Social Studies/Social Science Education 145

2.1 Introduction 146

2.2 An Overview of Research in Social Studies/Social Science Education 148

2.3 Research on Effectiveness of Different Kinds of Content in Social Studies/Social Science Education 167

2.4 Research on Effectiveness and Efficiency of Social Studies/Social Science Instructional Methods and Techniques 170

2.5 Research on Effectiveness and Efficiency of Social Studies/Social Science Educational Materials 194

2.6 Research on the Effects of Learner Variables in Social Studies/Social Science Education 198

2.7 Research on the Effectiveness of the "New Social Studies" 206

2.8 Research on the Social and Political Knowledge, Skill, and Attitudes Outcomes of Schooling 209

2.9 Research on Teacher Education in Social Studies/ Social Science Education 251

Section 3.0--Needs in Social Studies/Social Science Education 263

Section 4.0--The "New Social Studies" 291

References 324

Table of Tables

Page

Table 1: Articles Published in *Social Education* by Subject and Time Periods 14

Table 2: Number of Articles in the Teaching of/and Curricula of the Social Studies During Four Time Periods 15

Table 3: Number of Articles According to Focus on Educational Level During the Four Time Periods 16

Table 4: Occupational Field of Authors During Four Time Periods . . 16

Table 5: Proportion of Male and Female Authors in *Social Education* Throughout the Four Time Periods 17

Table 6: Geographic Area of Authors of *Social Education* Articles During the Four Time Periods 17

Table 7: Developments Between 1970 and 1975 Mentioned Most Frequently 18

Table 8: Total Enrollment in Grades 7-12 35

Table 9: 1973--Social Studies Offerings and %'s of Enrollments (Grades 7-12) 35

Table 10: Social Studies Sequence: 1955-1975 37

Table 11: Teaching Methods Used by American History Teachers 49

Table 12: Special Motivational Aids and Techniques Suggested by American History Teachers 50

Table 13: Activities in Which Children Never Participated 51

Table 14: Evaluative Techniques Used by Teachers in American History. 53

Table 15: Usage of Various Methods, Techniques and Devices in Teaching Geography as Reported by A Selected Sampling of California Public Senior High School Geography Teachers 56

Table 16: Percent of Class Time Devoted to Means of Instruction . . . 59

Table 17: Text Evaluation 59

Table 18: Audio-Visual Equipment: Frequency of Use as Reported by a Selected Sampling of California Senior High School Teachers 61

Table 19: Ratings of Instructional Material Supply for Geography Instruction as Reported by a Selected Sampling of California Public Senior High School Geography Teachers 61

Page

Table 20: Reported Preferences for Five Approaches--All Respondents 75

Table 21: Summary: Number and Type of Studies 85

Table 22: Summary: Grade Levels 85

Table 23: Summary: Aspects Analyzed 86

Table 24: Evaluation of Twelve Current High School Economics Texts on the Basis of Criteria and Evidence in the AEA Textbook Report 102

Table 25: Davis Assessment of 18 Sets of Economics Curriculum Materials by Grade Level Cluster 107

Table 26: Percentage of Teachers Failing to Meet the Minimum State Requirements for the Social Science Courses They Taught in Illinois High Schools in 1956-57 127

Tabel 27: Provisions for Teaching Majors and Requirements in Semester Hours 128

Table 28: Distribution of Hours of the Social Sciences for a General Major in the Social Studies 129

Table 29: Summary of Semester Hours Required for Graduation and State Certification of Elementary Teachers 132

Table 30: Background of Methods Teachers--Training 135

Table 31: Background of Methods Teachers--Experience 136

Table 32: Background of Methods Teachers--Position on College/University Faculty 136

Table 33: Research Reviews Consulted 149

Table 34: Amount of Research--Annual Reviews 153

Table 35: Amount of Research--Multiyear Reviews 153

Table 36: Amount of Research--Dissertations 154

Table 37: Methodologies Used in Dissertations, 1934-1969 162

Table 38: Methodologies Used in Dissertations, 1969-1973 163

Table 39: Grade Level of Dissertations, 1969-1973 164

Table 40: Results of Experiments Comparing Inquiry Teaching Methods in Social Studies with Other Methods (1967-1972) . . . 174

Table 41: Rank Order of Median National Performance by Topic 212

Page

Table 42: Average Percent Correct on Social Studies Exercises: Pupil Population Groups Compared with State Averages 226

Table 43: South Carolina Versus National Item Percentages Correct for Each Subskill Area, All Students, Grade 4 232

Table 44: South Carolina Versus National Item Percentages Correct for Each Subskill Area, All Students, Grade 7 233

Table 45: South Carolina Versus National Item Percentages Correct for Each Subskill Area, Grade 11 233

Table 46: Extent of Awareness and Use of "New Social Studies" Project Materials (Summary of Surveys) 314

Table 47: Use of Project Material by State and Total Respondents . . 317

Table 48: Number and Percentage of Users of Each of Nine Sets of Materials, by State 318

Glossary of Initials and Acronyms

AAA	American Anthropological Association
AAG	Association of American Geographers
ACSP	Anthropology Curriculum Study Project
ACT	American College Testing Program
AEA	American Economics Association
AERA	American Educational Research Association
AHA	American Historical Association
APA	American Psychological Association
APSA	American Political Science Association
ASA	American Sociological Association
ASCD	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
CTBS	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
ERIC	Educational Resources Information Center
ERIC/ChESS	ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education
ERIC/SMEAC	ERIC Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education
HSGP	High School Geography Project
ITBS	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
ITED	Iowas Tests of Educational Development
JCEE	Joint Council on Economic Education
MACOS	Man: A Course of Study
MSAT	Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NCSS	National Council for the Social Studies
NDEA	National Defense Education Act
NEA	National Education Association
NIE	National Institute of Education

NSF	National Science Foundation
PSAT	Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Text
SAT	Scholastic Aptitude Text
SRSS	Sociological Resources for the Social Studies
SSEC	Social Science Education Consortium
USOE	U.S. Office of Education

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1976, the National Science Foundation contracted with the Center for Science and Mathematics Education (CSME) at The Ohio State University to conduct a survey of the literature on needs and practices in precollege science, mathematics, and social science education for the period 1955 through 1975. The Center subcontracted the social science portion of the project to the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC).

SSEC's task was to identify, analyze, and summarize the literature produced between 1955 and 1975 concerning:

1) the state of and trends in practices in precollege social science education;
2) the effectiveness and efficiency of practices in precollege social science education; and
3) the state of and trends in perceptions of needs in precollege social science education.

The project was to take one year, from July 1976 through June 1977.

Procedures

Four procedural questions loomed large during the project:

1) whether to distinguish between social studies education and social science education, and if so, how;
2) what specific topics to consider within the broad three-point outline given above;
3) how to search the literature in order to identify all relevant documents; and

4) how to select specific documents for analysis or mention in the report.

Social Studies/Social Science. The definition of the field of social studies education has been a central and continuing problem for the profession. One of the major questions within this issue has been the estent to which precollege social studies education should be governed by or limited to the boundaries of the academic disciplines of the social sciences. (A lengthier discussion of the nature of the definitional controversy may be found in the early part of Section 4.0 of this report.)

Because this issue has been so important in the field, it was decided that this report must reflect the controversy. Hence, rather than limiting our review only to the literature dealing with social studies defined as social science education, we have taken a broad approach and dealt with social studies from multiple perspectives.

However, we have, where possible and appropriate, focused special attention on literature dealing with the social science aspects of social studies education. For instance, in Section 1.4, we have devoted extensive discussion to studies of the treatment of social science content and methods in social studies curriculum materials.

Specific Topics. The detailed working outline for the report has gone through numerous revisions in the course of the project. The rough outline developed at the very beginning of the project contained over 150 questions that we thought might be answered through our review of the literature. Examples of questions included on this initial "wish list" of things we would like to find out were: What are representative social studies program objectives? What is the relative emphasis on history and social science in the curriculum? What are the dominant instructional strategies in use? What sorts of "fads" have there been in social studies over the years? How well tested are social studies materials prior to publication? What curriculum packages are most commonly used? How well financed is social studies in comparison to other areas of the curriculum? What are typical course patterns for social studies teacher training? What kinds of instructional methods are most effective? Most efficient? What kinds of people have been most active in making demands on the social studies curriculum? What kinds of administrative support and inservice training are typically provided by school districts for social studies teachers?

As we progressed through the review, a number of these initial questions were dropped on the grounds that they were trivial or only of tangential interest. Others were dropped because there was not literature dealing with them. (Sometimes these latter questions were, however, mentioned in the report in order to point out the absence of inforamtion on significant questions.) The major areas of concern that remained intact throughout the review and writing process were:

1) social studies curriculum scope and sequence
2) social studies instructional methods
3) social studies curriculum materials
4) social studies teacher education

We sought and found information on practices, effectiveness, and needs in all these areas.

Search Strategy. At the beginning of the project, a number of extensive, systematic searches were conducted on several data bases. As the project progressed and specific gaps within particular topics were identified, highly focused, systematic searches were conducted as needed. Also, as the project progressed--and especially near the end of the project--less systematic means were used to "pinch hit" where systematic searches had not turned up documentation we thought might be available. For instance, we would follow up references in footnotes or phone someone considered to be an expert on a particular topic for suggestions of sources.

The extensive, systematic searches consisted of the following:

1) Computer search of the ERIC data base (includes Resources in Education and Current Index to Journals in Education)
2) Computer search of Dissertation Abstracts
3) Computer search of Psychological Abstracts
4) Computer search of Sociological Abstracts
5) Manual search of Education Index
6) Manual search of all comprehensive reviews of research in social studies education
7) Manual search of all compilations of abstracts of dissertations in social studies education
8) Manual search of the journal Social Education

For a complete list of the search terms used in the four computer searches, see the appendix at the end of this report, beginning on page 538. Education Index was searched under all terms beginning with the words "social studies." Since the comprehensive reviews, the dissertation compilations and Social Education focused specifically on social studies documents, all items mentioned in them were considered relevant initially. (For a detailed listing of the reviews and the compilations, please see the discussion of sources in Section 2.2 of this report.)

The special-focus, systematic searches conducted as need arose during the project consisted of both computer and manual searches of the ERIC data base; manual searches of various handbooks, encyclopedias, and state-of-the-art monographs; and manual searches of the SSEC's collection of curriculum materials and background documents in its Resource and Demonstration Center and archives.

A total of 1,038 usable items were produced by the initial extensive computer search of the ERIC data base. (Culling of duplications and irrelevant items from the initial printout reduced the original 1,677 to the 1,038 figure.) The computer search of Psychological Abstracts produced a total of 265 items, of which 155 were usable; of Sociological Abstracts, 81 items, of which 15 were usable; and of Dissertation Abstracts (which was searched only from 1973, since the compilations covered the previous period), 186, of which 85 were usable. Exact numbers of citations from the comprehensive reviews and the dissertation compilations are given in Section 2.2 of this report. We did not keep track of the numbers of items turned up in the more limited systematic searches and the unsystematic searches. Although the exact size of the total pool of documents identified cannot be determined, due to overlap among data bases and other problems, we would estimate that the total pool was four to five times the number of documents actually cited in the report; that is, the total pool would be approximately 2,000 to 2,500 documents.

Selection of Documents for Inclusion. We have attempted to indicate in each section of the report what types of documents were selected for mention in that section and what guidelines were used in choosing those documents and rejecting others.

In some sections, we have attempted to be exhaustive and mention all pertinent documents. For instance, in Section 1.4, we felt this report an appropriate occasion for compiling as complete a list as possible of all the textbook content analyses that had been done in the last 20 years. In Section 2.0, we deemed it absolutely necessary to include all comprehensive and special-focus reviews of research in social studies education from the last

20 years. And, in Section 4.0, it was considered important to identify all of the studies of the impact of "new social studies" materials. There have been so few studies of impact that every little bit of information available becomes important.

In other sections, we have attempted to present only representative documents. In most cases, this is due to the fact that there is simply too much literature to discuss or even mention each document separately. This is particularly true of the section on perceptions of needs in the social studies (Section 3.0).

One guideline that has been applied throughout this report is that the documents mentioned must be accessible. Readers must be able to obtain copies through a commercial publisher, ERIC, or some other ongoing agency. In a few cases we ran across "fugitive" documents that we put into ERIC; ERIC order numbers (ED numbers) are given for these and the documents that were already in ERIC in the entries in the reference list at the end of this report. In a couple of cases, fugitive documents that we wished to use could not be put into ERIC; in those cases, we have noted in the entry in the reference list how readers may obtain photoduplications of the documents.

Organization of This Report

This report is organized into four major sections. Section 1.0 describes the literature that surveys the state of actual practices in social studies education and changes in those patterns over the 20-year period. This section focuses on the "status" literature, as distinguished from the "research" literature-that is, studies attempting to discern relationships among variables. Section 2.0 takes up these questions of relationships, by examining research on the effectiveness and efficiency of social studies practices. Section 3.0 then examines the problem of identifying needs in the social studies. And, finally, Section 4.0 takes a look at certain aspects of the "new social studies," which can be considered the major trend or movement influencing the field during the last 20 years. More specific information on the contents of each of these four major sections can be obtained from the detailed table of contents provided for this report.

In addition to the four major sections, there is a lengthy reference list containing full bibliographic information on each document mentioned in this report. There is also an appendix at the end of the report describing the search terms used in the computer searches.

Summary of Findings

One hundred fifteen "summary observations" have been listed at various points throughout this report. These comments are intended to present, in capsule form, a description of what the literature on precollege social studies education from 1955 to 1975 tells us. They are grouped at the end of each major section or subsection of the report, immediately following the narrative discussing and documenting them. The table of contents indicates the specific pages on which these summary observations may be found. Some readers may wish to read through the summary observations before (or instead of) reading the full report or specific sections.

Since 115 summary observations, each of one sentence or more, is still a lot of reading, we have attempted here to distill them further yet, in order to give the reader a preview of what is contained in this review of 20 years of social studies literature. The paragraphs below present the barest essentials only, for, while we have gained conciseness by this introductory summary, we have lost a certain amount of preciseness. It is highly recommended that readers at least examine the end-of-section summary observations in addition to this brief overview of findings.

Summary of Literature on the STATE of Social Studies Practices

1) State of the Status Literature

Although there have been a fair number of studies examining the state of social studies practices at various times during the last two decades, we do not obtain a very clear picture of many aspects of practice from these studies. Probably the clearest status picture available is that concerning curriculum materials; numerous analyses of the content of materials have been done. We have a less clear picture of patterns of actual classroom practice and how they may or may not have changed over the 20-year period. And surveys of the state of teacher education practices give us very little information at all.

2) Curriculum Content

Althought the scope and sequence of the social studies curriculum has remained basically stable in general outline over the 20-year period from 1955 through 1975, there have been a few noticeable shifts within that framework. Particularly noticeable has been the infusion of concepts and methodologies from the scientifically oriented social science disciplines. (See Section 1.2 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

3) Instructional Practices

Studies of the extent of use of various kinds of social studies classroom practices at various points in time are rather limited. The studies that do exist indicate that, contrary to popular belief, the lecture method may not have been nearly so pervasive in the fifties and sixties as has been claimed; a sizeable proportion of teachers employed multiple instructional techniques. Recent studies do not indicate clearly whether patterns of instructional methods have changed as a result of the "new social studies" and other educational innovations. (See Section 1.3 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

4) Curriculum Materials

A substantial number of studies have analyzed social studies curriculum materials. The aspects of materials that have been analyzed most frequently are (a) their treatment of social science content and methods; (b) their treatment of specific concepts and themes (such as communism, violence, social change); and (c) their treatment of minority groups. Almost without exception, analysts of social science content and methods in social studies curriculum materials have concluded that there are inadequacies in treatment of the social sciences by textbooks. (See Section 1.4 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

5) Teacher Education

Most studies of the academic preparation of social studies teachers have concluded that there are major deficiencies in their social science coursework. (Studies cited in Section 2.0, on effectiveness, however, call into question the value of additional coursework in the social sciences.) Surveys of course requirements in teacher training institutions indicate a slight trend away from the dominance of history and toward the inclusion of more social science courses; however, no such pattern is apparent in surveys of state certification requirement. (See Section 1.5 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

Summary of Literature on the EFFECTIVENESS of Social Studies Practices

1) State of Research on Effectivness

Social studies educators have not been very much interested in or affected by research. Only recently has research in the field begun to blossom. There are many complaints about the lack of a cumulative research base in the field. (See Section 2.2 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

2) Curriculum Content

Little or no empirical research has focused on questions about the relative merits of different kinds of content in achieving the goals of the social studies. (See Section 2.3 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

3) Instructional Methods

A large proportion of the effectiveness research conducted in the social studies falls under the heading of research on instructional methods and much of this focuses on various methods labeled "critical thinking," "inquiry," and the like. Most of this research shows no significant differences between critical thinking methods and so-called traditional methods; however, weaknesses in research design and weaknesses in attempts at interpreting existing research may well be hiding real differences in effectiveness. Some telling results in regard to carefully and narrowly defined techniques have been obtained from research. (See Section 2.4 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

4) Curriculum Materials

There has not been a great deal of research on the effects of curriculum materials and there has been even less effort directed toward interpreting what little research there is in this area. (See Section 2.5 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

5) Learner Variables

Research on the effects of various learner variables (such as student attitudes, interests, abilities, and socioeconomic backgrounds) on learning in the social studies is rather spotty. There has been an interest in how children's developmental abilities affect learning in the social studies and a few researchers have been able to draw conclusions from this body of research; however, their findings have apparently not been put into practice by curriculum developers and teachers, as yet. (See Section 2.6 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

6) "New Social Studies"

No attempts have been made to draw conclusions from the body of research surrounding the development of the "new social studies" project materials. (See Section 2.7 for documentation.)

7) Outcomes of Schooling

National achievement testing programs have produced trend data on social studies achievement at lower cognitive levels. These data indicate that students' knowledge of so-called basic information in the social disciplines, particularly history, is declining. National and state assessment efforts in social studies and citizenship have produced results in a wider variety of areas, including attitudinal outcomes of schooling; however, because assessment efforts are recent developments, trend data are not available here. The testing programs and assessments do not generally attempt to tie test results to possible causal variables in test-takers' backgrounds. However, a few studies have attempted to make such linkages and have generally found that gross variables, such as number of credit hours taken in social studies have limited effects on learning outcomes. (See Section 2.8 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

8) Teacher Education

Social studies teacher education has become an important research interest only within the last decade. Cumulative findings in this area are few and suggest that, even though a variety of teacher training practices produce changes in teacher behavior, student teacher training in academic content and instructional methods may hold the best promise for affecting student outcomes. (See Section 2.9 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation.)

Summary of Literature on NEEDS in Social Studies Education

1) Definition of Social Studies

Because the question of the purposes and boundaries of the field of social studies remains unsettled, it is difficult to pinpoint needs in any precise sense. All manner of needs--including some contradictory ones--have been claimed for the social studies.

2) Academic Freedom

One of the few things on which social studies educators seem to have been able to agree is that academic freedom and the difficulties of dealing with controversial issues in the classroom pose a problem of particularly strong significance for social studies teachers, due to the inherently "hot" nature of the subject matter.

3) Social Scientists' Perceptions of Needs

During the sixties, social scientists exercised a particularly strong influence on the social studies, attempting to infuse more and better social science content and methods into the curriculum.

4) Laypersons' Perceptions of Needs

The influence of laypersons (people who are neither social scientists nor professional social studies educators) on the social studies has waxed and waned over the 20-year period from 1955 to 1975 and the demands of laypersons have displayed no consistent pattern from one period to the next.

(See Section 3.0 for a more detailed set of findings and documentation for all of the above conclusions.)

Summary of Literature on NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

1) Characteristics of the "New Social Studies"

There are many differing perceptions of what the characteristics of the "new social studies" are, although at least seven "core" characteristics seem to be generally agreed upon. (For a list of these characteristics and documentation, see Section 4.0.)

2) Criticisms of the "New Social Studies"

At least ten different categories of criticisms have been advanced against the "new social studies" over the last decade. (For a list of these categories and documentation, see Section 4.0.)

3) Impact of the "New Social Studies"

Some data on the impact of the "new social studies" are available. These show that the national project materials have not been widely adopted by school systems, but they do not shed light on other possible modes of influence, such as impact on the kinds of materials being developed by commercial publishers. (See Section 4.0 for additional discussion and documentation on impact.)

Section 1.0

LITERATURE DESCRIBING THE STATE OF AND TRENDS IN
SOCIAL STUDIES/SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION
PRACTICES, 1955-1975

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Trends in Social Studies Curriculum Content

1.3 The State of Instructional and Administrative Practices in Social Studies

1.4 The State of Social Studies Curriculum Materials

1.5 The State of Social Studies Teacher Education

1.1 Introduction

Section 1.0 reviews the findings of the descriptive literature on social studies education during the period 1955-1975. There are four major subsections. The first subsection (1.2) describes the content of the social studies curriculum at various points within the 20-year period, looking at trends in objectives, scope, and sequence at both the elementary and secondary levels. The second subsection (1.3) describes the kinds of instructional and administrative practices that were commonly used in the social studies during the period under consideration. The third section examines the content of curriculum materials (particularly textbooks) is use from 1955 to 1975. Finally, subsection 1.5 attempts to pull together what little information there is on common patterns of academic preparation of social studies teachers during 1955-1975.

Social studies curriculum guides from states and districts were the main source of information for subsection 1.2; analyses of materials, for subsection 1.4; and surveys (largely mailed questionnaire rather than interview or observation) provided much of the information for subsections 1.3 and 1.5. The kinds of documents used for this section differed from those used in the research section (2.0), which follows. For this section we sought "status" studies, designed only or primarily to describe the state of practices rather than to explore relationships among practices and other variables. This section focuses on what existed rather than what was effective or ineffective.

Before proceeding to the major subsections, we would like to describe the findings of three studies that do not appear to fit into any of the categories of the subsections but nevertheless provide insights into the state of social studies/social science education during the 20-year period.

First, in 1970, Chapin and Gross examined the contents of the National Council for the Social Studies' journal, Social Education, for the prior three decades. The contents of Social Education have probably reflected thinking and practice slightly ahead of widespread adoption, although not so far ahead as to be out of touch with the norm in the social studies profession. Thus, Chapin and Gross' findings can be interpreted as indicators of the coming and current trends in the field during the period.

In regard to academic subject matter of articles, Chapin and Gross found that, until recently, of the academic disciplines composing the social studies (see list in Table 1 below), history had been dominant. Subjects such as sociology and psychology had received little or no attention. Not only had history dominated among articles focusing on subject matter, it had also dominated in articles focusing on teaching. (See the two tables below.)

Table 1.

Articles Published in Social Education
by Subject and Time Periods

CATEGORIES	1937-38	1947-48	1957-58	1967-68
Academic Social Studies	26 (19%)	22 (19%)	62 (40%)	31 (17%)
History	13	12	27	6
Geography	1	1	5	6
Economics	4	1	2	0
Political Science	5	4	9	10
Sociology	2	2	1	0
Anthropology	0	1	0	8
Psychology	0	1	0	0
Area Studies (Multi-disciplinary)	1	0	18	1
Quasi-Social Sciences	14 (10%)	25 (21%)	12 (7%)	14 (5%)
International Education	6	10	6	8
Citizenship	7	13	3	4
Conservation	0	1	1	0
Consumer Education	1	1	0	0
Humanities	0	0	2	2

Teaching Focus	99 (71%)	70 (60%)	73 (40%)	131 (74%)
Curriculum	44	17	22	66
Instruction	20	5	14	12
Methods	20	5	14	12
Social Studies Skills	9	18	10	22
Media and Materials	8	11	15	14
Social Studies Teachers	5	8	4	10
Learners and Guidance	7	6	7	4
Evaluation	6	5	1	3
Other Journals are Saying, In Scholarly Journals, Have You Read?	1	1	12	0
Research	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	140	118	159	178

(Chapin and Gross 1970, p. 789)

Table 2.

Number of Articles in the Teaching of/and Curricula of the Social Studies During Four Time Periods

CATEGORIES	1937-38	1947-48	1957-58	1967-68
General Trends and Programs	27	6	12	14
Specific Areas				
History	10	1	3	21
Geography	0	0	0	3
Economics	1	0	1	4
Political Science (Law)	0	0	0	7
Sociology	0	0	0	2
Anthropology	0	0	0	6
Psychology	0	0	0	0
Area Studies	0	2	4	3
International Education	0	4	0	3
Controversial Issues	6	2	0	2
Science and Social Studies	0	0	0	1
Social Studies in Other Countries	0	2	2	0
TOTAL	44	17	22	66

(Chapin and Gross 1970, p. 789)

Another area examined by Chapin and Gross was grade level to which articles were addressed. In 1967-68, there was a substantial increase in elementary-focused articles, reflecting the inauguration of a special elementary section in the journal. Additionally, in recent years, there has been an increase in articles focusing upon all grade levels or that are addressed to general interests.

Table 3.

Number of Articles According to Focus on Educational Level During the Four Time Periods

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	1937-38	1947-48	1957-58	1967-68
Mainly Elementary (K-8)	18 (13%)	19	24	44 (25%)
Mainly Secondary (9-12)	61 (44%)	34	38	33 (20%)
Higher Education (13-14)	5 (04%)	6	3	1 (0%)
All Grade Levels or Not Clearly Differentiated	56 (40%)	59	104	100 (56%)
TOTAL	140	118	159	178

(Chapin and Gross 1970, p. 790)

Chapin and Gross also looked at characteristics of authors. Among some of their more interesting tables are the three reproduced below, showing the occupational field of authors, the sex of authors, and the geographic region of authors.

Table 4.

Occupational Field of Authors During Four Time Periods

CATEGORIES	1937-38		1947-48		1957-58		1967-68	
Higher Education	73 (52%)		71		94		116 (65%)	
Social Sciences		36 (26%)		26		39		42 (24%)
Education		32 (23%)		37		40		63 (35%)
Joint Appointment		2		2		6		4
Other Departments		2		4		4		2
Graduate Students		1		2		5		5
K-12	54 (39%)		36		47		39 (22%)	
Secondary Teachers		37		23		33		13
Elem. (Jr. High) Teach.		4		1		6		9
Elem. Consultants		2		5		6		5
Consultants, not defined		2		6		0		8
Administrators, St. Dept.		9		1		2		4
Associations	8 (6%)		11		17		23 (13%)	
Non-profit		4		7		7		16
Federal employees		2		4		8		3
Profit-making institution		2		0		1		3
Foreign visitor		2		0		1		1
Committees, Unknown	5 (4%)		0		1		0	
TOTAL	140		118		159		178	

(Chapin and Gross 1970, p. 792)

Table 5.

Proportion of Male and Female Authors in *Social Education* Throughout the Four Time Periods

CATEGORIES	1937–38	1947–48	1957–58	1967–68
Males	99	92	140	143
Females	39 (28%)	26 (22%)	19 (12%)	33 (14%)
Committees, etc.	2	0	0	2
TOTAL	140	118	159	178

(Chapin and Gross 1970, p. 794)

Table 6.

Geographic Area of Authors of *Social Education* Articles During Four Time Periods

GEOGRAPHIC AREA	1937–38	1947–48	1957–58	1967–68
East	69 (50%)	46	80	59 (33%)
South (also Tenn., Md.)	9 (6%)	9	8	17 (10%)
Middle West to Miss. R.	34 (24%)	37	36	43 (24%)
Great Plains/Rocky M.	19 (14%)	16	11	24 (13%)
Far West	6 (4%)	9	23	33 (19%)
Foreign	1	1	1	2
Committee, not appl.	2	0	0	0
TOTAL	140	118	159	178

(Chapin and Gross 1970, p. 793)

In their summary, Chapin and Gross noted the following:

1) There has been a "dearth of attention to the behavioral sciences." (p. 794)

2) In the mid-era of its existence, Social Education did become more academically oriented. This may well reflect the national academic binge of the 1950s." (P. 794) However, except for one period, the journal had featured a predominance of articles related to the practitioner--the area of curriculum and instruction.

3) The bulk of practitioner-oriented articles, however, has been geared to the high school.

4) The journal had taken a "kid-gloves" approach to controversial issues in the profession.

5) One of the "most striking findings" was the lack of articles on research. Chapin and Gross did not know whether this reflected a true lack of research in social studies of lack of interest by the journal's readers or some other factor.

In reviewing the literature on the state of practices in social studies, one gets the overwhelming impression that, were it not for Richard Gross, we would not have much status information. He, more than just about any other social studies educator of the current era, has made a habit of periodically undertaking the tedious but immensely helpful task of "counting heads" to determine exactly what is happening in the field. Most recently Gross conducted a survey of the status of social studies in the public schools of the U.S. (1977). Many of his findings from this study are reported and discussed elsewhere in this report; however, one cluster of information did not seem to fit within our category system and, so, is reproduced here. Gross asked district and state social studies supervisors throughout the country what had been the major changes and tendencies affecting social studies in the last five years. The list generated by respondents appears below:

Table 7.

Developments Between 1970 and 1975 Mentioned Most Frequently

- Growth of Senior High Electives
- Program Fragmentation and Dilution
- Local Level Curriculum Revision
- Drop in Required Social Studies
- Choices or Options Within Social Studies Requirements
- Impact of New Social Studies Projects
- Back To Basics; More Time to Reading
- Decline in Social Studies in Elementary Grades
- Growth of Mini-Courses
- Increased Local Options and Mandates
- Work on Articulation and Coordination, K–12
- Required Economics or Virtues of Free Enterprise
- Decrease in History Enrollments
- New Valuing Emphases
- Greater Parental and Public Concern
- Emphasis Upon Law and Citizenship
- More State and Local History
- Pressures for Consumer and Career Education
- Performance Objectives/Competencies
- Increase in Area Studies
- Specialized Ethnic Offerings

(Gross 1977, p. 200)

Gross eliminated from his list factors mentioned that tended to affect the entire curriculum and not just social studies. Among these were seriously reduced funding, popular alternative programs, inadequately trained personnel, lack of administrative leadership, and small rural schools. Gross also noted that the pace of change has been rapid and many respondents were of the opinion that we were past the apex of some of the developments listed, such as minicourses, ethnic studies as separate offerings, and even "the anarchical curriculum." On the other hand, Gross found his respondents felt that the popularity of gaming and simulation was still rising and that interest in law and citizenship would continue to increase.

Finally, Irving Morrissett is another educator who has attempted to keep a finger on the pulse of the profession, through his Curriculum Information Network (CIN) surveys. One of those surveys (Morrissett 1974) queried the Network members about the climate for innovation in their schools. At that time the Network was made up of 321 Social Education readers, a group that might be considered somewhat more innovative and professionally active than the average social studies educator. Overall, Morrissett found that the respondents saw a climate favorable to innovation both at the present and in the future. They were slightly more optimistic about their own districts than about the U.S. as a whole, however. Further overall findings were as follows:

> Respondents from the South are the most sanguine about the climate for innovation, both in the U.S. and in their own districts. Respondents from the West share the moderate optimism of the rest of the nation with respect to the future climate for innovation in the nation, but take a somewhat dimmer view of prospects in their own districts.
>
> School districts, on the average, are perceived as being a little better than "somewhat helpful" to teachers, chairmen, and others in their efforts to innovate, while state education agencies are seen as being substantially less helpful than local districts.

> The NCSS _Curriculum Guidelines_ (December 1971 _Social Education_) have been "somewhat helpful" to the respondents, while the general activities and publications of NCSS had a fairly high rating as aids to innovation, ranking almost midway between "somewhat helpful" and "very helpful."
>
> A question about who the chief facilitators of innovation in the school district are elicited the response that teachers are the main innovators, with principals and consultants next but far behind.

(Morrissett 1974, pp. 555-56)

1.2 Trends in Social Studies Curriculum Content

This subsection was written by Jeanne Race, Teacher, Liverpool School District, Liverpool, New York, while she was serving as a Teacher Associate at the Social Science Education Consortium.

This subsection of the report reviews the literature on what kinds of subject matter were dealt with in the social studies curriculum over the 20-year period, 1955-1975. It opens with a discussion of differing views as to what constitutes the social studies, then examines typical objectives expressed at various time intervals, next describes the most common patterns of content covered in social studies courses at various levels over the two decades (the "scope" of the social studies), and finally looks at trends in the sequence of course offerings. Also, the treatment of controversial issues within the social studies curriculum is given some special attention. The subsection includes several detailed tables showing trends in social studies objectives, scope, and sequence. The summary observations on page 70 gives an overview of our findings in regard to trends in social studies curriculum content.

Sources

This section is based upon an examination of social science organizations' newsletters, position papers, and guidelines; state and district curriculum guides; and other guides and course descriptions, including bibliographies and teacher resources. Also reviewed were National Council for the Social Studies' How To Do It series and yearbooks. Materials from the national social science curriculum projects were also examined. In addition, articles pertaining to this topic that were listed in the Education Index for the years 1955-1970 were examined; dissertations and other research studies that dealt with objectives, scope, and sequence in the 20-year period were perused; and textbook studies and adoption lists proved valuable. Reviews of research also contributed. National surveys and studies, such as the one put out by the Department of Education in Virginia (1976) and the one done recently by Richard Gross (1977) helped to give a total picture of sequence throughout the nation. State educational nbeds assessments were also examined.

Documentation and Discussion

Definition of Social Studies

Since the first use of the label social studies in 1916, there have been many attempts to define the term. The experts did not agree on a definition then, anymore than they have in the period between 1955 and 1975. This lack of agreement as to what social studies really is, what it should be, and how it should be taught has had a profound effect on curriculum structure and content.

The most quoted definition is Wesley's (1958). Wesley stated:

> Social studies are those portions or aspects of the social sciences that have been selected and adapted for use in the school or in other instructional situations. The term "social studies" indicates materials whose content as well as aim is predominantly social. The social studies are the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes. (p. 3)

Gross and Badger (cited in Massialas and Smith 1965, p. 5) stated:

> The social studies are those studies that provide understandings of man's way of living, of the basic needs of man, of the activities in which he engages to meet his needs, and of the institutions he has developed.

These are content-oriented views of the social studies. Both Wesley and Gross view social studies as transmitted knowledge. This knowledge focuses on human social adaptations.

Others have been more concerned with describing social studies in terms of the processes involved. Engle (1976) believes that:

> . . . social studies is more correctly thought of as the formal effort of the school to develop in the students the full gamut of awareness, conceptual frameworks, and skills from which they can more effectively engage in wide ranging social criticism.

The battle ground has been widened further by those who believe that the social studies should emphasize the social sciences' content and/or processes versus those who want to focus on citizenship education content and/or processes. Two of those who advocate a social science content approach are Keller and Berelson (cited in Engle 1965, p. 2). Keller (cited in Massialas and Smith 1965, p. 2) stated that the term "social studies" should be eliminated as it is too vague. Keller declared that "social studies is not a subject; it is a Federation of Subjects." According to Keller, the accent should be placed on the content and discipline of the subject and on cognitive rather than affective goals. Berelson (cited in Engle 1965, p. 3) agreed with Keller. Because Berelson saw the social studies as being basically the same as they were in 1916, he called for revision with stress on the social science disciplines.

Hanna (cited in Engle 1965, p. 4) stressed a synthesis of the content of the social sciences around the expanding-community theme and thus concurred with Keller and Berelson concerning the focus on social science content. However, citizenship was also an important focus to Hanna. Good citizenship might be the outcome, but it was not be be the essential focus for Keller and Berelson. It was more important to Hanna.

There are also educational experts who would prefer to see the social studies structured around the processes of the social sciences. Burner (cited in Engle 1965, p. 4) wanted "the student to become a miniscule social scientist and the classroom a reasonable facsimile of the social science laboratory."

Massialas (cited in Haas 1977, p. 37) was concerned about the processes that will lead to good citizenship. He advocated involving the student in discovery by "the study of value conflicts in our society and alternative approaches to understanidng and resolving them." Metcalf (cited in Haas 1977, p. 38) said that the aim of the social studies is to foster reflective thought in the "closed areas." The "closed areas" were defined as areas of belief and thought which are largely closed to rational thought, such as sex, economics, religion, race, and social class. Metcalf mainly wanted this process of reflective thought on "closed areas" to be applied at the secondary level. He was concerned with the process of valuing.

Barth and Shermis (1970) felt that there were three approaches to the social studies. They were (1) social studies as social science, (2) social science as reflective inquiry, and (3) social studies as citizenship transmission. Barth and Shermis concurred with Metcalf, Massialas and Engle that social studies should be reflective inquiry (process) with students making decisions and solving problems as the way to become good citizens.

More recently Brubaker et al. (1977) delineated five models for social studies. They are (1) social studies as knowledge of the past as a guide to good citizenship, (2) social studies in the student-centered tradition, (3) social studies as reflective inquiry, (4) social studies as structure of the disciplines, and (5) social studies as socio-political involvement. Models 1 and 4 are basically content-oriented while the other models are more concerned with process. Morrissett (1977) conducted a survey and found that most social studies teachers perceive themselves as process oriented while they see their associates as well as the nation as being content oriented.

So the debate still rages as to what social studies is, what it should be, and how it should be taught. Should it be content or process? Should it focus on the social science disciplines or on citizenship education? These unresolved questions account for what the objectives, sequence, and scope of the social studies have been or have not been during the 1955-1975 time period.

Indicators of Curriculum Content

Often teachers who have been unable or unwilling to resolve the questions in their own minds have relied on state or local curriculum guides or on textbook publishers to settle the issue for them. Cruikshanks (1957) traced the development of the social studies curriculum from 1893 to 1955 and found much evidence to indicate that textbooks are major determinants of the curriculum. Barnes (1960), noting that social studies course sequences were very similar nationwide, suggested that nationally distributed textbooks reflected common values held by citizens throughout the country. Ellsworth (1962), however, believed that organization of the curriculum by textbook was waning.

Two studies done in Nebraska (Godwin 1967 and Saunders 1968) produced some findings that may shed some light on the question of how accurately textbooks and state and local curriculum guides reflect what is actually taught in the classroom. Godwin found that more than half the elementary teachers in Nebraska districts without full-time elementary curriculum directors followed the textbook guide rather than the State Department of Education's guide or the local district's guide. Saunders, studying districts that did employ a full-time elementary curriculum director, found that about half the elementary teachers used a basic text as their chief source of social studies information, but also over half the teachers regularly used the district-developed course of study and less than one-sixth used the state department's guide.

In the discussion that follows, we have relied primarily on state and local curriculum guides as indicators of the objectives, scope, and sequence of the social studies curriculum.

Trends in Social Studies Objectives

Trends in curriculum content in the social studies can be observed by taking a look at social studies objectives within the categories of knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Tables showing typical objectives in each of these three categories during five periods from 1955 to 1975 are included in the appendix. Table A-1 shows continuities and changes in social studies knowledge objectives from 1955 through 1975. Table A-2 shows continuities and changes in social studies attitude objectives during that period. Table A-3 shows continuities and changes in social studies skill objectives during that time.

Curriculum guides from states and localities, as well as a few surveys of such guides, were used in compiling these charts. It was difficult to obtain guides for some time periods, particularly for the years around 1960. For some unknown reason, many of the guides for that period have been destroyed. (One wonders whether the revisionist fervor that hit the social studies in the early sixties perhaps encouraged--or at least did not discourage--the destruction of the symbols of the past, such as curriculum guides.) Because of the dearth of guides for the 1960 slot, we have relied primarily on Wade's 1964 study as the source of typical objectives for the 1960 period. Our own tally of the objectives found in curriculum guides provided the data for the other periods. For the most part, we have tried to employ the terminology most commonly used in the guides for the various periods. However, for the sake of uniformity, we have taken the liberty of stating objectives in performance terms, even though this format was not typical of the earlier guides.

Differences in objectives for various grade levels have not been distinguished. In general, one can assume that the differences among grade levels are matters of depth of treatment rather than differences in kinds of content.

Each of the three tables is arranged as follows. Across the top are listed five dates: 1955, 1960, 1965, 1970, and 1975. The column under each date enumerates a series of objectives that were found to be typical in the curriculum guides published in the cluster of years centered on the given date. (For instance, the guides used for the 1970 column fell within the period 1968-1972.) Down the lefthand side of the table are listed a number of topics, indicating in a rough manner the focus of the objectives enumerated across each row. For instance, the first topic in the table of knowledge objectives is "interdependence." The reader will note that no interdependence objective is given for 1960; this indicates that interdependence was not found to be a common focus of knowledge objectives during the 1960 period.

Knowledge Objectives: Findings. Table A-1 presents typical social studies knowledge objectives for the period 1955-1975. In 1955 there were fewer knowledge objectives than in 1975 and there was greater consensus on what they should be. Almost all of the typical 1955 objectives are still found frequently in some form in 1975, but a number of new objectives have been added to this inherited set. This picture of apparent stability is modified, however, when one examines intervening time periods; then one finds, for instance, that knowledge of the American economic system is the only objective appearing in every time preiod. A noteworthy trend is shown in the greater emphasis given the social science disciplines--particularly the "newer" behavioral sciences--in the objectives for 1975.

Attitude Objectives: Findings. Attitude objectives from 1955 to 1975 are displayed in Table A-2. As with knowledge objectives, there were more attitude objectives stated in most curriculum guides at the end of the 20-year period than there were at the beginning. One attitude objective was important through the entire 20 years: that the students be good citizens and act accordingly. There seeme to have been a decline in emphasis on attitudes toward the law and authority during the 1960s compared to the 1950s, but there was a return to stressing respect for the law and authority during the 1970s. There appears to be less overlap between attitude objectives in 1975 and attitude objectives in 1955 than was the case with knowledge objectives in 1955 and 1975. Two virtues that seemed to be extolled to a great degree in the 1960s only were honesty and respect for one's elders. New emphases of the 1970s include awareness of reasons for one's beliefs and actions; participation and involvement; attention to career opportunities and leisure time activities; self-actualization; and the like.

Skill Objectives: Findings. Skill objectives from 1955 to 1975 are displayed in Table A-3. The greatest emphasis on skills (or, at least, the greatest variety of skills) appeared around 1965 rather than in the seventies, as we had originally surmised. As additional evidence of the high interest in skills at that time, one might note the appearance of the 33rd Yearbook for the National Council for the Social Studies (1963), which was devoted to skill development in the social studies. Perhaps many of the "new social studies" projects, with their emphasis on skills, were influenced by the heavy interest in skills during the mid-sixties.

Two sets of skills were found throughout the 20-year time period: problem-solving skills and data-gathering and analysis skills. Although geographic skills (such as map and globe skills) were mentioned, they were not among the most frequently mentioned, much to our surprise; thus, they do not show up in the table. Such skills were emphasized more in the earlier than the later part of the 20-year period. Reading skills, likewise were not mentioned very frequently and they were most often mentioned around 1955. There was increasing emphasis over the 20-year period on creativity and curiosity.

The back-to-basics movement, with its emphasis on basic skills, apparently had not hit by the time the 1975 curriculum guides went to press. We would guess that curriculum guides in the late 1970s will give greater attention to skills in general and to reading and writing skills in particular.

Scope of the Social Studies

One often hears social studies educators speak of the "scope and sequence" of the social studies. Scope refers to the extent of content covered in social studies courses; to define the scope of the social studies, one must define the boundaries of the field--what is in and what is out. Sequence refers to the order in which various aspects of content are to be taken up in the progression through the grades.

As has been mentioned previously--and will be mentioned numerous other times throughout this report--the scope of the social studies is subject to much controversy. Social studies educators have been much criticized for their tendency to "solve" the definitional problem by including just about everything within the bailiwick of social studies. For instance, Metcalf (1963) noted the tendency of social studies educators to list huge numbers of objectives for social studies courses, generally stating them in nebulous terms and not noticing that some contradicted others.

Because of this eclecticism in objectives, the types of courses offered under the label of social studies are widely divergent. For example, Kansas in 1964 included in its social studies program a course on home living. Some school in Pennsylvania in 1969 included sex education under social studies. And driver education was even listed as a social studies requirement in some school systems in the early sixties. This diversity has not abated in the 1970s; guidance, ethics, philosophy, humanities, intergroup education, drug education, and student development were but a few of the course titles that we came across in our survey of curriculum guides.

Table A-4 shows the content most often included in social studies course offerings at each grade level for the same five time periods used in the preceding objective tables. The emphasis in this table is on cognitive content, with little attention to skill and attitude components of the curriculum. The table was derived from tallies of topics mentioned in state and local curriculum guides. For some time periods and grade levels, we were able to obtain only a few or no guides. There are blanks where no guides were accessible; where only a few guides were available, we filled in the cells using those few guides and assuming that they were more or less representative.

Among the conclusions that can be reached from examination of the scope table are the following:

1) In grade one, the scope becomes progressively more cosmopolitan, or multicultural, and less rurally oriented from 1955 to 1975.

2) In the second grade, the focus on the neighborhood takes on more and more of an urban tinge over the 20-year period.

3) There seems to be an increasingly comparative orientation in community studies in the third grade as one moves from 1955 to 1975.

4) The emphasis on world regional geography at the beginning of the period in the fourth grade is partially replaced by state history in 1975.

5) Fifth-grade U.S. history appears to have come under the influence of a "presentist" orientation in 1975, while in the earlier periods more or less traditional U.S. history topics were dominant.

6) The traditional sixth-grade focus on the Western Hemisphere is replaced in 1975 by a world cultures course, drawing heavily on social science content, especially from anthropology.

7) There seem to have been a great deal of fluctuation in the content taught at the seventh-grade level over the 20-year period. However, one trend is apparent in a shift from early emphasis on regional studies (of Africa, Europe, Russia, and the like) to emphasis on broad themes, such as gaps between the rich and poor nations and national independence movements.

8) The eighth-grade U.S. history course has remained basically the same, except for decreased attention to state history.

9) As with the seventh-grade social studies course, the ninth-grade course has experienced much fluctuation, including various combinations of world geography, civics, world cultures, and state history.

10) Grade ten world history appears to have remained fairly stable over the 20 years under study.

11) The 11th grade American history course has been transformed from one

with a primarily political orientation to a study of many aspects of the country's social, economic, and cultural development.

12) The 12th-grade problems course has been replaced with a variety of social science courses, including sociology, anthropology, geography, economics, psychology, and government.

Some other courses which are now being offered at various grade levels are not included in Table A-4. Examples from curriculum guides of the objectives and content of these "new" courses include: career education, citizenship, education, consumer education, environmental education, ethnic studies, and legal education.

Changes in Elementary Scope. The 20-year period from 1955 to 1975 witnessed a continuation of the expanding-environments theme in elementary social studies. ("Expanding environments"--sometimes called "expanding communities" or "expanding horizons"--refers to a geographic expansion of the area studied as one progresses through grades, beginning with home and family in K-1, broadening to neighborhood in grade two, and so on.) However, notable changes did occur within the theme's boundaries. Educators such as Kenworthy (1962) began to question the expanding-environment approach. Did a child really come into contact with, or relate to, the world or environment at a time or did the child learn about "far" at the same time that he or she learned about "near"? Has mass communication and transportation brought the "remote" world as close as the neighborhood or community? Kenworthy and other critics believed that they had and that the social studies curriculum should reflect this. By 1975, a study of families usually included not only one's own family but also families around the world. The same was true for neighborhoods and communities.

It also became more common during the later '60s and the '70s to introduce the social science disciplines into elementary programs. Social scientists began to insist that elementary students could and should be acquainted with concepts and methods from the social science disciplines.

In some cases, it was argued social science content should be introduced from the inception of the child's formal education; in other cases, the intermediate grades were thought to be the proper place to begin. For instance, Lawrence Senesh's Our Working World, while basically maintaining the expanding-environments theme, introduced social science concepts in grade one. Man: A Course of Study (MACOS) introduced the behavioral sciences in the fifth grade.

In the early sixties, Jarolimek (cited in Bailey and Clune 1965) had argued that "the segregation of content into various disciplines may be entirely appropriate for the adult student, but such an arrangement is not recommended as a program of study for young children." Attempts were made in the sixties to incorporate the social science disciplines while addressing Kenworthy's complaint by using interdisciplinary approaches. For instance, the Harvard-Lexington program (Gibson 1965, p. 84) used the following set of goal statements, reflecting influences from several disciplines:

1. Man has various ways of meeting similar needs.
2. Man has adapted to a variety of natural habitats.
3. Man finds new ways to control his relationship to his environment.
4. Technology has changed the production and distribution of goods and services and has created new opportunities and problems for human society.
5. There is a variety of patterns and development and independence within and among nations.
6. Man's act of inquiry, creativity, and expression evolve from and influence his culture.

The program was for K-9 and was intended to move pupils' attention from near to far and far to near, from known to unknown and unknown to known. It was an attempt to improve upon the framework of expanding geographic areas and expanding areas of experience while introducing students to the social science disciplines.

Changes in Secondary Scope. Throughout the nation, there have been fairly uniform course and credit requirements at the secondary level over the 20-year period. The course most often required is American history. About 39 of the states plus the District of Columbia require the teaching of American history and the Federal Constitution (National Survey . . . 1976). Many states, in order to avoid repetition, have eliminated the American history course at the junior high level and now only teach it once at the secondary level, usually in the 11th grade. Some states and districts have made the junior-year course into "American studies," emphasizing certain themes or topics with less focus on chronology. A few states recommend American history but do not require it on the secondary level. They have allowed schools to offer other social studies options only indirectly related to American history. Some schools, however, still offer American history as a two-year course because they feel that there is too much to cover in one year. Kirkendall (1975) has noted a tendency to regard history as irrelevant and impractical .

World history is required by about 15 states (National Survey . . . 1976). World history survey courses have been giving way to replacements such as world culture studies (Patterns of Course Offerings . . . 1972).

Other secondary requirements nationwide according to Virginia's survey (National Survey . . . 1976) are as follows: state history including the state constitution--34 states; consumer education--six states; environmental studies--four states; career education--four states; law-related education--four states; and civics--five states. Other states offer these courses, but they are not at present required to do so.

Instruction about the "free enterprise system" must be incorporated into the social studies program in some way in 14 states. Another required area is some study of communism and other totalitarian forms of government. Seven states currently require work in this area.* An analysis of this area of study (Gray 1964, p. 72-73) showed the following characteristics;

1. These courses are often based on the assumption that communism is a total evil in complete opposition to all democratic principles. Materials are then presented to support the assumption. Little or no consideration is given to the measure in which communism may appeal to the underpriviledged people in the underdeveloped nations as an extension of democracy.

2. There is a marked tendency to contrast the darkest realities of communism in the Soviet Union with the noblest ideals of American democracy.

3. There is a tendency to use broad sweeping generalizations composed of emotionally loaded words, such as slavery, menace, evil, threat, deadly, deceitful, dishonest, and the like.

4. They present a picture of an unswerving, monolithic world Communist power dominated by the Soviet Union.

5. They fail to consider possible differences among scholars on the nature of communism. For the most part these courses present only one point of view.

6. There is an almost total lack of reference to works by Communists for purposes of objective and analytical study.

7. There is a general concentration on the so-called fallacies and failures of communism. Little or no attention is given to its strengths and its successes.

8. There is a tendency to equate capitalism and democracy.

---

*It is interesting to note that the number of states having such a requirement in 1964 was eight (Gray 1964, p. 71).

American government is usually required at the secondary level. There are quite a few ways of placing it in the curriculum. The most common are as a separate course, and as part of an American history course.

Overall, four to six semesters of social studies or social sciences are usually required on the senior high level.

Figures on secondary social studies course enrollements can give some general indication of what kinds of content students are actually begin exposed to, as distinct from what curriculum guides, statuses, and the like require or recommend. Two tables from Gross (1977) are enlightening here. The first shows changes in social studies course enrollments from 1961 to 1973.

The second shows the percentage of schools offering various social studies courses and the enrollment in those offerings.

Table

Total Enrollment in Grades 7–12

1961	1973	% Increase
11,700,000	18,500,000	59%

Changes in Social Studies Course Enrollment, Grades 9–12

Course	1961	1973	% Change
Civics	733,000	449,000	−39%
Sr. Probs.—P.O.D.	380,000	298,000	−22%
World History	1,471,000	1,541,000	+5%
World Geography	595,000	736,000	+24%
U.S. Government	780,000	1,306,000	+67%
U.S. History	1,994,000	3,464,000	+74%
Economics	293,000	592,000	+102%
Sociology	289,000	796,000	+175%
Psychology	140,000	590,000	+323%

(Gress 1977, p. 196)

Table 9

1973—Social Studies Offerings and %'s of Enrollments (Grades 7–12)

Total U.S. Public Secondary Schools	Total Secondary Enrollment
22,737	18,500,000

Course	% of Schools Offering Course	% of Enrollment in Schools Offering Course
U.S. History (7–8)	32%	33%
U.S. History (9–12)	53%	27%
World History	51%	17%
Geography	45%	14%
U.S. Government	45%	16%
Sociology	36%	8%
Psychology	30%	9%
Economics	36%	7%
Civics	21%	17%
Sr. Probs.—P.O.D.	20%	11%
State & Local History (7–8)	16%	39%
State & Local History (9–12)	12%	15%
Area Studies	14%	5%–14%
Ethnic Studies	10%	17%
Anthropology	6%	5%
Law Education	14%	7%

(Gross 1977, p. 196)

Gross notes that enrollments in U.S. history and U.S. government kept apace with growth in total enrollments during the decade examined, but growth in enrollments in world history and world geography did not. There were actual decreases in ninth-grade civics and 12th-grade problems courses, some of which were redirected to new social studies offerings and some of which enrolled instead in areas outside the social studies. The figures clearly reveal, according to Gross, an "invasion of the social studies by the social sciences." Overall,

> it is clear that the traditional pattern of high school social studies offerings, rather stable since the 1917 Report of the Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education established the program, has finally been shattered. (p. 196)

Sequence of the Social Studies

The kinds of courses most commonly offered at the various grade levels in the five time periods from 1955 to 1975 are shown in the sequence chart, Table 10, **beginning on page** 37. This table is a distillation of the information from the scope chart, giving only course titles plus a small amount of additional information. The items in parentheses indicate particular approaches within the main topic or additional topics that received less emphasis than the main topic.

At the elementary level, as mentioned previously, the expanding-environments theme was fairly well established at the beginning of the period covered and has remained so through 1975, although within this theme there have been some changes in approach. The sequence at the secondary level has also remained basically stable. The most notable changes have been the disappearance of courses labelled geography and civics at the ninth-grade level and the replacement of the 12th-grade problems course with a proliferation of electives focusing on social sciences and currently popular topics.

Regional and Urban-Rural Differences

While there has been an amazing amount of similarity in scope and sequence, there have been a few regional, as well as urban-rural, differences.

Anderson (1964) reported that the South offered civics and state history

Table 10

Social Studies Sequence: 1955-1975

Grade Level	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
K	Often Kindergarten did not exist. If it did exist an introduction to the home or school was usually done as the social studies lesson.	A social studies course for kindergarten was not usually listed. If any course did exist, it dealt with the family the most often.	Home and School Relationships	Home (School, Family, Group Living and Adjustment)	Home and School
1	Living together at home and school (Pets, farms, neighborhoods)	Living together in home, school, and community	Home and school	Families (School, home, community)	Families (Neighborhoods)
2	Living together in the community (neighborhood)	Community (neighborhood, food, clothing, helpers)	Families and neighborhoods (helpers, communication, transportation)	Neighborhoods (communities, cities)	Neighborhoods (communities)
3	Living together in the community (local community, basic necessities)	Basic necessities Our community (health and safety)	Community	Communities (cities)	Communities (cities)
4	Climatic regions of the world (geographic approach)	Beginning readiness for history and geography--regions of the world	World communities (history and geography)	Geographic and cultural regions	State history World geography
5	United States history and geography	American history	United States history	American history	Unites States history

Grade Level	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
6	America's neighbors (and Eurasia)	The World (Eastern or Western hemisphere, Old World [Europe])	America's Neighbors	Western hemisphere	World cultures Western hemisphere
7	The Eastern hemisphere	World geography (Eastern or Western hemisphere)	Eastern hemisphere State history	World Cultures State history	World Cultures Eastern hemisphere
8	The United States history--State history	American history State history	United States history history	United States history (civics)	American history
9	World geography and historical backgrounds	Civics	Civics--World geography--Vocational Guidance	Civics--Non-Western world culture studies Overview of social sciences (the student--the individual)	World Studies--State history (civics)
10	World history and geographic settings	World history	World history	World History (American studies)	World history
11	American history and government	American history	American history	United States history (American studies)	United States history

Grade Level	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
12	American Problems (social and economic approaches)	Problems of Democracy Psychology, Government, (Sociology)	Government--Economics Psychology--Problems of Democracy	Psychology--Sociology--Economics--Government--(Problems of Democracy) (International Relations) (Consumer Education)	Psychology--Sociology--Economics--Government--Anthropology--(Geography) (Humanities) (Local History) (Career Education) (Ethnic Studies) (Law-Related Education) (Environmental Education) (Citizenship Education) (Problems of Democracy)

Sources Used for Sequence Charts

American Culture, 1970; Black Studies, 1970; Content, Trends and Topics in the Social Studies, 1962; Curriculum Guide Grade 4-7, 1968; Curriculum Guide to Social Studies, Grades 4-6, 1969; Exemplar, 1970; Focus on Man, 1971; Fort Benton Social Studies Curriculum Outline, 1970; Framework for the Social Studies, Grades K-12, 1970; Framework for the Social Studies in Wyoming, Grades K-12, 1969; National Survey, 1976; Navajo Area Curriculum Development Project Grades 5-8, 1970; Organization of the Elementary and School Social Studies Curriculum, 1957; The Program of Social Studies Instruction Grades K-12, 1969; A Rationale for Elementary Social Studies Programs, 1971; Social Sciences Education Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten and Grades One Through Twelve, 1968; Social Science Guide, K-12, 1967; Social Studies, 1960; Social Studies, 1970; The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary Schools of Virginia, 1976; Social Studies Education, 1969; Social Studies Guide, 1970; Social Studies Guide: Kindergarten--Level Twelve, 1970; Social Studies in Oregon Secondary Schools, 1955; Social Studies Program for Idaho Public Schools, Grades K-12, Revised Edition, 1974; Social Studies in Secondary Schools, 1964; Social Studies in the Senior High School, 1965; Social Studies Today, 1970; Social Studies Today, 1971; A Study of Recent Changes in the Social Studies Program of the Public Schools, 1964; A Survey of Elementary School Social Studies Programs, 1957; What Are We Teaching in Social Studies and Science?, 1960.

more often than any other sections and the East offered the problems of democracy course more than any other sections of the country. In another survey done in the same time period (Survey of Social Studies Teaching 1964), it was noted that Eastern schools offered modern European history while Western schools stressed Oriental history. Small rural schools tend to offer state history and civics; this may account for the South's high showings in these areas.

Jennings (cited in Cox and Massialas 1967, pp. 295-99) discoverd a variation in curriculum offerings according to the size of the school. Usually the small schools would be characterized by sociology as the major elective and a general world history course. Large schools emphasized problems of democracy courses and specialized world history courses.

Economics was the only course not fluctuating considerably among the regions. The Northeast offered specialized world history and problems courses more than other sections. American government and sociology were offered much less in the Northeast than in other regions. The Midwest stressed geography and international and comparative politics more than other regions. The South placed a low emphasis on the problems course. The West stressed psychology more than other regions. The Midwest offered the greatest diversity in social studies courses.

Jennings and Levenson (1968) reported that students in the West took more social studies courses than students in other sections of the country. They also observed that if American government was offered then a problems of democracy course usually was not. The American government course stressed the forms, structures, background and traditions of American political life, while the problems course stressed the major sociopolitical, contemporary problems in American public life. American government was strongest in the Midwest, while the problems course was strongest in the West. The Northeast was more likely to offer problems than government. The South was more likely to offer government than problems.

Kimball (1970) concluded that, among regions, there was little difference, except that the courses taught in the schools in the Midwest seem to be more the survey type than those taught elsewhere. All regions seemed to stress the history of western Europe at the expense of the history of other parts of the world. Economics was increasing in popularity. Economics was taught less commonly in the schools of the South and the West than in those of the Northeast and Midwest. The problems of democracy course was on the decline; by 1970, it was not taught as frequently in the Northeast as elsewhere in the country.

Treatment of Controversial Issues

There has been considerable discussion over whether controversial issues should be dealt with in the social studies classroom. If controverisal issues are discussed at all, what issues should be selected? What methods should be used? What should be the role of the teacher and the community? What policy guidelines might be helpful? A sampling of the literature on dealing with controversial issues in the social studies is presented here.

In 1956 Deam (cited in Gross and Badger 1960, p. 217) found that the five least acceptable issues for class discussion were: (1) the religious affiliation of the President, (2) the use of force in obtaining confessions, (3) the merits of socialism, (4) extending free speech to advocates of forcible overthrow of government, and (5) the effects of integration in public schools. Deam discovered that only a bare majority favored teachers' stating their own views on current issues, even when identified as such and supported by reasons. Even teachers accepted limitations upon their freedom to teach. Teachers were willing to endorse the principle that controversial issues should be presented in the classroom, but they readily submitted to pressure to prevent discussion of certain topics that were taboo in local areas.

In 1960 Fiske (cited in Lunstrum 1965, p. 124) reported that even such a topic as the activities of UNESCO was controversial and, thus, avoided in the classroom.

In a 1962 National Education Association study (cited in Lunstrum 1965, p. 123), most of the secondary school teachers questioned reported that they encountered little or no opposition to teaching about communism and the United Nations. A greater proportion of elementary teachers (21.7 percent) reported varying amounts of opposition to teaching about communism in local communities. (See description of Gray study earlier in this section.) It was suggested that teachers be encouraged to teach about the concept of totalitarianism, thus encompassing both the right and the left.

By 1975, Morrissett found that no topic is entirely free from restriction nor is any topic so restricted that it cannot be used with some freedom. In his Curriculum Information Network survey, the topics the respondents felt most free to discuss in their classrooms were: (1) faults in our system of government, (2) the free enterprise system in the U.S., (3) the Klu Klux Klan, (4) drugs, and (5) Vietnam amnesty. The respondents felt least free to discuss: (1) homosexaulity, (2) heterosexual sex, (3) prostitution, (4) pornography, and (5) abortion. College teachers felt the most free to discuss all issues. Perceived freedom of discussion declined with grade level. If pressure existed for avoiding controversial issues, it most often came from parents. The report showed a need for teacher training in conflict resolution.

Ballinger (cited in Lunstrum 1965, p. 138) noted that the texts used in methods classes did not discuss the theoretical and practical problems involved in the presentation of controversial materials in the classroom. It should be noted that this problem may have been alleviated by now. Many methods texts now contain material on dealing with controversy and there are a number of publications docusing specifically on this--for instance the 1975 Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (Muessig 1975).

Kardatzke (cited in Johnson et al. 1972, p. 74) discovered that teachers who took an extreme position on controversial issues tended to be more willing to introduce such issues into class discussions. Ling (cited in Payette et al. 1970, p. 28) discovered that male teachers were more permissive and expressive in controversial situations than female teachers. Massialas, Sweeney, and Freitag (cited in Johnson et al. 1972, p. 74) found that most teachers expressed a willingness to discuss most controversial issues. When teachers chose to limit topics, pupil maturity, pertinence of topic, or personal reservations were given as reasons for limiations more often than administrative and community disapproval. Social studies teachers showed more willingness to deal with controversial issues than did biology or English teachers. Male and older, more experienced teachers were more willing to deal with controversial issues. Of the teachers surveyed, social studies teachers spend the most time with controversial issues, but 87 percent of the teachers reported spending less than 25 percent of class time dealing with controversial issues.

As the role of the teacher has been subject to discussion, so has the role of the community. Lieberman (cited in Massialas and Smith 1965, p. 122) argued that local control of the school contributed heavily to avoidance of topics in the classroom. Drabick (cited in Massialas and Smith 1965, p. 122), in a similar view, stated that teachers acquiesced in the norms of the community and adjusted their performance according to the expectations of members of the community. However, Coan (cited in Massialas and Smith 1965, p. 122) revealed that parents of school children in Kansas were generally agreeable to inclusion of controversial issues in social studies. He said that social studies instructors had more latitude in the treatment of controversial issues than they realized, although it was true that special interest groups opposed discussion of certain topics and some questioned the methods used.

Some attempts to establish policies and procedures for handling controversial issues have been made. The National Education Association found in 1961 that an increasing number of schools were operating under specific written policy statements that guided the teaching of controversial subjects. An example of a policy is that of Cincinnati. The Cincinnati public schools in 1965 established the policy that teachers would not become advocates of any particular point of view, but rather see that all sides of the question were considered fairly and that evidence be presented. Teachers should not attempt to influence decisions of pupils but should serve as consultants who assist in clarifying issues and who assure that the democratic standards of conduct, fair play, tolerance, and the right of free speech are maintained.

Kirby (cited in Cox et al. 1966, p. 124) made an appraisal of teacher and principal attitudes toward controversial issues by interviewing 106 social studies teachers and 20 principals. The interviewees agreed that the schools are obligated to deal with controversial issues. In the school year 1961-62, communism; race relations; nation, state, and local politics; and religion were the most frequently discussed issues of a controversial nature in social studies classrooms. More attention was given to adult problems than to problems of concern to adolescents. A greater percentage of principals than teachers believed that the school had an obligation to deal with controversial issues.

One of the largest surveys on teaching controversial issues was McAulay's (1965). McAulay polled 648 elementary teachers about controversial issues. Eighty percent of these teachers said that they did not discuss controversial issues in their classes. Primary teachers viewed divorce as controversial while intermediate teachers viewed religion as controversial. Eleven percent of the teachers believed that they were sufficiently competent to handle contorversial issues. Schremser (cited in Cox et al. 1968, p. 98) found no need for broad policies and administrative guidelines for teaching controversial issues. Teacher training and inservice programs could deal with the teaching of controversial issues. Administrative leadership and guidance would be helpful.

Censorship has existed. Nelson and Roberts (cited in Massialas and Smith 1965, p. 128) observed in the 1960s a resurgence of organized efforts to censor textbooks, particularly in the social studies. Some publishers and school systems yielded to the demands that changes be made in certain textbooks. Carp (1968) found that the groups most likely to assert censorship pressure were patriotic organizations, conservative groups, religious organizations, (e.g., the Jehovah's Witnesses, B'nai B'rith) and "miscellaneous" groups who believe that certain materials are "too scientific" because they de-emphasize the spiritual side of development or are immoral. Patriotic organizations and conservative groups are most active in urban areas and religious organizatons are strongest in rural areas. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers surveyed found censorship pressure to be "nonexistent" in their school districts; 32 percent thought it was not a serious problem; while ten percent thought it was a serious problem. There was more censorship pressure in urban and suburban schools than there was in rural ones. This is because the "best coordinated, the most militant, and the best financed" groups were found in urban areas. Rural teachers were subject to their own unique brand of coercion, self-censorship. They took care not to offend the community.

Summary

It is important to emphasize again that there has been an increasing trend toward integrating the social science content and skills into the social studies curriculum. Social studies on the elementary level has become more interdisciplinary. Materials dealing with social science content and skills are available at the elementary level, if the teacher wishes to use them.

On the secondary level there has been an increasing tendency to offer one-semester courses on each of the social science disciplines. The enrollment in such courses doubled between 1960 and 1970 (Patterns of Course Offerings . . . 1972). Theprojects of the 1960s endeavored to create secondary level materials for most of the disciplines. Gross (1977) reported that there was limited use of the project materials, however. Many teachers had not even heard of the projects. Gross noted that psychology was the fastest growing course in high school social studies programs. Sociology and economics had increased in enrollment, also.

Through the whole 20-year period (1955-1975), courses have come to include more material on the non-Western world and world affairs in general. Many social studies educators feel that there must be even more concentrations on these areas. Gross (1977) tells us that law and citizenship education programs are increasing nationwide and predicts a continuation of this trend. State and local history courses are becoming more and more popular. Environmental education is being dealt with both in science and social studies classes. Ethnic studies courses are much more evident now than in the fifties.

Other areas have exhibited decline. For instance, in the 1950s and 1960s the study of communism and totalitarianism was encouraged through state recommendation more than it is today, even though the number of state requiring its teaching has remained about the same. The McCarthy period certainly had an effect on social studies education.

Certainly one area that has declined is the study of history. History has found itself losing out more and more to courses that place greater emphasis on an interdisciplinary social science approaches (Kirkendall 1975). In order to combat this trend, there has been a "tendency in the teaching of history to incorporate the substance, techniques, and methods of the other social science disciplines into history courses." American history remains the dominant social studies course, however. The course is likely to retain that position, but with more infusion of the methods and content of the social science disciplines.

World history has given way to more specialized courses. Because of these trends, there is likely to be less need for history teachers.

The ninth-grade civics course and the 12-grade problems course have sharply declined in enrollment in the 1970s.

Overall, Gross says (1977), "Social studies enrollment is not growing as much as it should be." Further, he noted, "Elementary teachers are backing away from social studies, particularly at the primary level." With the current emphasis on "back to basics," primary teachers feel that there is not time for social studies.

Summary Observations

1) There is a lack of agreement as to what social studies really is, what it should be, and how it should be taught. This problem has typically been "solved" by including "anything and everything" in the social studies program.

2) Knowledge, attitude, and skill objectives in the social studies have changed in varying degrees during the years 1955-1975. The number and variety of both knowledge and attitude objectives have increased over the 20-year period, while the variety of skill objectives was greatest around 1965.

3). The scope and sequence of the elementary social studies program have been governed by the expanding-environment theme throughout the 20-year period, but within that new emphases have appeared, including greater attention to studies of other cultures and incorporation of more content from the social sciences.

4) On the secondary level, elective courses focusing on social sciences and on content topics (e.g., ethnic studies, career education) have proliferated at the 12th-grade level, replacing the problems of democracy course, and the ninth-grade civics course has almost disappeared. However, the American history course is still the course most commonly offered throughout the country.

5) At all levels and in all courses--even history courses--the trend toward integrating more of the content and methodology of the social sciences into the social studies has been marked. The "newer" behavioral sciences (anthropology, psychology, and sociology) have particularly experienced increased attention.

6) While courses such as legal education and citizenship education have experienced marked growth in recent years, courses such as civics and problems of democracy have seen declines.

7) The problem of dealing with controversial issues in the social studies curriculum remains a major concern related to curriculum content.

1.3 The State of Instructional and Administrative Practices in Social Studies

In this subsection, we have sought to draw a picture of the common patterns of instructional and administrative practices in social studies in the U.S. during four periods: the 1950s, 1960-64, 1965-69, and 1970-75. Unfortunately, the picture drawn is far, far from clear. Since we are interested here simply in the *state* of practices, we have looked for what Kerlinger (1964, p. 392) calls *status* surveys rather than reports of research on relations among variables. (The latter kind of research is reported in Section 2.0 of this report, on the effectiveness of different variables.) The status literature on practices is one of the most barren areas of social studies research during the last two decades.

The discussion below is organized by period. Each period is broken down into six categories: types of instructional activities, classroom interaction and questioning; grouping; evaluation practices; use of materials; and administrative practices. These are the six areas with which status surveys of practices in social studies have dealt.

Sources

As mentioned above, sources of information on the extent of use of various practices in social studies are scarce and scattered. The comprehensive reviews of research in the social studies and the three compilations of dissertations were used as starting points for indentification of such status studies. Most of the studies we found were dissertations (and, in most cases, only the abstract was available at the time of writing). Whenever possible, we obtained full copies of the few published articles available in order to "milk" the limited information available for all it was worth. Fewer than 50 documents were used for this subsection.

Documentation and Discussion

Practices: 1950s

Types of Instructional Activities. A study done in 1951 (Gross 1952) found that group discussion, supervised study, recitation, and teacher-made guide sheets or syllabi were the teaching methods most used by American history teachers in 100 senior and junior high schools in California. The table below presents the full findings.

Table 11

TEACHING METHODS USED BY AMERICAN HISTORY TEACHERS

Technique	Percentage Using				Percentage not Answering
	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	
Group Discussion	75	22	2	0	2
Supervised Study	64	30	4	2	0
Audio-Visual Aids	55	37	5	0	3
Library Research	44	47	7	1	1
Individual Topics or Reports	40	50	7	0	3
Map Work	48	40	10	1	1
Recitations	64	22	6	4	4
Individualized Assignments	37	47	9	0	7
Notebooks	41	26	15	15	3
Teacher-made Guide Sheetsoor Syllabi	61	25	20	14	5
Lecture	25	38	25	8	4
Source Readings	18	47	25	3	7
Teacher-Pupil Planning	10	52	18	1	19
Group Projects	17	41	24	7	11
Resource Speakers	1	18	50	25	6
Excursions	1	16	35	40	8
Socio-Dramas	3	12	28	47	10
Workbooks	4	8	7	73	8

(Gross 1952, p. 159)

Gross also queried the sample about special motivational aids and techniques. His findings are presented in the following table:

Table 12

SPECIAL MOTIVATIONAL AIDS AND TECHNIQUES SUGGESTED BY AMERICAN HISTORY TEACHERS

Aids and Techniques	Percentage of Teachers Suggesting
Supplementary Readings	43
Able and Interested Teachers	38
Audio-Visual Aids	23
Tie History to Meaningful Pupil Experiences	22
Pictures, Globes, Maps & Charts	22
Student Activity	15
Movies	15
Current Events	14
Individual and Group Reports	14
Commercial Recordings	12
Dramatizations	11
Tie History to Community Activities	11
Panels and Round Tables	10
Historical Novels	10
Biographies	10
Source Readings	8
Radio Programs	7
Correlating Classes	7
Library Recordings	6
Classroom Recordings	6
Slides, Film Strips, and Opague Projections	6
Socio-Dramas	5
Debates	5
Transcriptions of Radio Programs	5
Newspapers and Magazines	4
Special Classroom and Assembly Programs	4
Non-Fiction Books	3

(Gross 1965, p. 160)

Another 1951 study (Grace R. Stacey et al., An Analysis of Likes and Dislikes for History and Geography of 3,360 Sixth Grade Children, unpublished master's thesis, Boston University, cited in Chase and Wilson 1958, p. 24) reported on activities in history and geography that elementary children had never participated in, as follows:

Table 13

ACTIVITIES IN WHICH CHILDREN NEVER PARTICIPATED

History	
--making time lines	57.10
--keeping a news bulletin board	36.06
--making booklets	34.32
--making models	33.06
--taking field trips	32.99
--dramatizations	32.00
--making things for exhibits and bulletin boards	26.51
--quiz programs	18.51
Geography	
--using workbooks	59.99
--taking field trips	55.21
--keeping bulletin board	41.67
--dramatizations	39.63
--making a class booklet about countries	37.81
--making murals	37.76
--making charts and graphs	36.03
--preparing exhibits	27.27
--listening to resource visitors	24.99
--outlining	15.94
--reporting news about countries	12.59

Chase and Wilson commented that other studies have shown similar results.

Chase and Wilson also described two studies comparing techniques used in ten social studies classrooms in which a majority of the fifth-graders preferred social studies to other subjects ("high") and ten in which a majority did not rate social studies as their first, second, or third preference ("low"). One study was done in 1947 (William A. Wolffer, Techniques and Practices Used in Twenty Social Studies Classrooms, unpublished master's thesis, Boston University, 1948) and the other, done in 1957, replicated the first (Richard Cobleigh et al., Subject preferences of Fifth-Grade Children, unpublished master's thesis, Boston University, 1957). The findings show that those classes in which fifth graders liked social studies were characterized by use of the unit method; cooperative planning; a variety of instructional practice and teaching aids; emphasis on the acquisition of book, map, and study skills; provision for individual needs; opportunities for developing responsibility; and awareness of success and improvement.

Gross and Badger (1960), citing a couple of dissertations done during the latter part of the fifties, commented that, although lecture and formalized recitation had long been under attack, both continued to be used to a considerable degree in classroom practice. They also noted, however, that teacher-pupil planning had been increasingly accepted.

Siemers (1960) reported on the instructional practices of 100 tenth-grade California world history teachers who responded to a questionnaire in 1959. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers favored the chronological approach, with over one-third using this approach exclusively. The topical approach was used by 30 percent, with eight percent using it exclusively. Two-thirds of the sample used some form of "teaching units," with teacher lectures and class discussion as primary teaching devices. Eighty percent said they used memorization of key historical dates weekly; 25 percent used oral reports weekly; and 59 percent used films weekly or two or three times a month. Among the techniques that substantial numbers indicated they never used were panels (36 percent never used); debates (46 percent); dramatizations or role playing (81 percent); filmstrips (28 percent); textbooks other than those issues to the students (58 percent); recordings (40 percent); radio or television (36 percent); and paperbacks for outside reading (23 percent).

Classroom Interaction and Questioning. No studies were found during the 1950s period dealing with the extent of practices related to classroom interaction and questioning.

Grouping. No studies were found for the 1950s period dealing with methods of grouping for instruction.

Evaluation Practices. Gross's 1951 study also yielded information on evaluation practices of U.S. history teachers (Gross 1953). The 100 California high school and junior high teachers were asked which of ten types of evaluative techniques they used. The results are shown in the table below:

Table 14

EVALUATIVE TECHNIQUES USED BY TEACHERS IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Evaluating Technique	Percentage Using as a Major Technique	Percentage Using as an Occasional Technique	Total Percentage Using Technique
Objective Tests, teacher-made	53	40	93
Class Discussion	51	42	93
Oral Reports	18	63	81
Essay Tests	24	52	76
Student Papers or or Notebooks	33	41	74
Group or Individual Projects	11	56	67
Citizenship and Behavior Displayed in School	14	46	60
Oral Quizzes	10	42	52
Objective Tests, Standardized	8	35	43
Citizenship Observed in Community	5	22	27
Other	--	--	10

(Gross 1953, p. 24)

Most teachers reported using three or four major means of evaluation. Gross noted the prime influence of subject matter on the choice of evaluative techniques; many other kinds of objectives were ignored. Although unlisted techniques such as "use of tests in texts," "current events tests in papers," and "text outlines and chapter questions" were mentioned by respondents, none mentioned such things as measures of critical thinking, special skill tests, attitudinal checks, self-evaluative techniques, inventories, rating scales, case studies, cumulative records, sociometric techniques, and observational checklists.

In 1959, Dwight W. Allen surveyed 600 members of the National Council for the Social Studies, selected at random from its mailing list, asking them about their views and practices in regard to evaluation. He summarized the conclusions of that study a decade later as follows (Gross and Allen 1967, p. 207):

1. Teachers frequently fail to relate their assessment practices to the aims they claim for their offerings.

2. Teachers are often inconsistent in their conception of evaluation.
3. Teachers are reticent, even ideally, to use the full range of evaluation techniques available.
4. The use of many evaluation devices is misunderstood and such devices are often minused.
5. Teachers place a great amount of blind faith in the indirect accomplishment of their objectives.
6. All the purposes of evaluation are not understood by many teachers.
7. Teachers indicated by their answers that in general they have a low level of statistical sophistication.
8. Teachers almost unanimously accept both essay and objective test items.
9. A disproportionate amount of time seems to be spent in the correction of English errors in social studies work.
10. The theory of sampling and test instruction is not understood by teachers.
11. More than half of the teachers ignore the value of student-constructed test items and only about half encourage pupil-grading and self-evaluation.
12. Few teachers employ item analysis or other checks upon their testing and evaluation procedures.
13. Teachers, by their practices, encourage students to regard grading as a coercive weapon to be used against them.
14. Very few teachers perceive the major implications of the evaluation program which carry beyond the grading of students.

Siemers' (1960) survey of 100 tenth-grade world history teachers in California in 1959 found that 42 percent of the sample of teachers used oral reports and 57 percent used written summaries as the primary means of evaluating outside reading (such as biographies and historical novels). The leading means of evaluation for the regular coursework for nearly two-thirds of the sample was teacher-constructed objectives tests and student contributions to class discussion. Almost half of the teachers claimed they never used group or committee work in evaluation; one-third said that student interest and cooperation did not enter into final evaluation. (Harrison and Solomon, in their 1964 comprehensive review, mention two other studies--one in California and one in Alabama--that found essentially the same patterns of evaluation practices.)

Use of Materials. Siemers (1960) that 92 percent of his sample of 100 tenth-grade world history teachers used a basic textbook of some kind, and 43 percent preferred using a two-volume text where such was available and appropriate for their students. Forty-nine percent used newspapers frequently, 45 percent used periodicals frequently, 55 percent used encyclopedias frequently, and 56 percent used materials developed from college notes and other sources frequently. This indicates the attempt to augment the text with the use of varied curricular materials is widespread, according to Siemers. However, as mentioned previously, 40 percent never used recordings, 28 percent never used filmstrips, 58 percent never used textbooks other than those issued to students, 36 percent never used radio and television, and 23 percent never used paperbacks for outside readings. In outside reading programs, biographies were used by 42 percent in all or nearly all units, while historical novels were used by only 23 percent in all or nearly all units. Palmer (1965) noted that Siemers' dissertation also reported that more than a third of the respondents considered poor instructional resources a major problem. Palmer commented, "Although many teachers criticize social studies textbooks, they evidently fail to look elsewhere for basic materials to put in the hands of students" (p. 156).

Gross and Badger, in their 1960 ten-year review of research in the social studies, claimed that, although teachers tended to use films "promiscuously," they hardly availed themselves at all of many other kinds of materials to supplement the text. For instance, "teachers fail to use even the maps and bulletin boards which are available in their own schoolrooms" (p. 219).

Administrative Practices. No studies on support services, materials selection practices, and the like were located for this period.

Practices: 1960-64

Types of Instructional Activities. In the early sixties, Lux (1962) did a study of the differences in methods employed by superior and nonsuperior teachers. One hundred fourteen teachers rated as "outstanding" or "superior" by administrators in Nebraska secondary schools and 35 teachers not rated as such filled out questionnaires about their practices. Lux noted that both the rated (superior) and unrated (not superior) teachers used the same kinds of activities, but to varying degrees. (pp. 192-193)

Gandy (1965) interviewed 48 geography teachers in 18 public secondary schools in California to learn what kinds of instructional procedures and materials were used in geography classrooms and what teachers thought of these materials and procedures. The findings in regard to methods used are presented in the table below (from p. 75 of Gandy's article):

Table 15

USAGE OF VARIOUS METHODS, TECHNIQUES AND DEVICES IN TEACHING GEOGRAPHY AS REPORTED BY A SELECTED SAMPLING OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Method, Technique or Device	Used	
		Often	Seldom
1.	Map exercises in which students make maps, locate places make interpretations, etc.	33	5
2.	Textbook assignments to guide student learning	33	5
3.	Work from Study Guides	30	8
4.	Supervised study in which the teacher emphasizes learnings to be obtained from assigned readings	29	9
5.	Use of current events activities and discussion	29	9
6.	Socialized recitations in which questions are used to guide and stimulate discussion	28	10
7.	Individual projects in which students are to accomplish a selected task within a given time.	26	12
8.	Keeping notebooks or making notebooks on selected countries	23	15
9.	Oral presentations by students individually or in groups	19	19
10.	Activities in which students make diagrams and charts	17	21
11.	Use of completion exercises in which notes with words or phrases omitted are structured by the teacher	17	21
12.	Problem solving; classroom organization and approach	15	23
13	Outlining lessons from text	11	27
14.	Projects in which two or more students collaborate	10	28
15	Use of lectures to present geographical information	10	28
16.	Writing of summaries or appraisals of the geography lesson	9	29
17.	Activities in which students make displays and exhibits	8	30
18.	Contract Plan in which a student "contracts" to do the amount of work for the grade he desires	8	30
19.	Completely independent work in which a student chooses his own means of learning	5	33
20.	Dramatization by students	3	35
21.	Use of commercial workbooks	3	35
22.	Student correspondence with foreign students	2	36
23.	Field trips of field studies	0	38

According to Penix (1965), the typical approach to teaching and reinforcing citizenship attitudes in the elementary grades has been "informal," emphasizing national holidays and heroes, patriotic events, the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and attention to electoral processes in election years.

Wilkinson (1964) surveyed 50 teachers, grades one through eight, about their procedures for teaching the concepts of interdependence, democracy, freedom, international relations, and intergroup relations. Her conclusions are listed below:

1. Much of what was taught about the five concepts under discussion was provided through the day-to-day living in the classroom. These activities included accepting foreign classmates, sharing, cooperation, working in groups, taking turns, resepcting the rights of others, nominating, voting and electing class officers, participating in planning, committee work, and class responsibilities.
2. The more formal procedures included lessons and unit work to protect a sequence of subject matter, study of current events, holidays, and biography.
3. The development of hobbies was encouraged. Some children as a result collected stamps, dolls, and foreign money.
4. The day-to-day living in the school setting provided important social learnings. Guest speakers in the classroom, interclass visitation, interclass sports, assembly programs, and school-wide projects furnished opportunities for learning through experiencing.
5. Worthy home membership was emphasized through discussions of sharing in home life, inviting parents to school, trips, and getting parents to share in school projects.
6. The teachers of children with retarded mental development (CRMD) stressed learning through living. Some of their experiences included discussion of food, trips to the market, discussion of where food came from and how the market receives it, preparation of food, invited luncheon guests voting for menu, electing officers of class, and others with responsibilities.
7. The teaching materials most frequently used on all grade levels were film strips. Other aids used included films, pictures, maps, and charts.
8. The teaching of the five concepts involved other curriculum areas, and subject matter. Most frequent use was made of songs, dramatics, stories, storytelling, and games. Included also were arts and crafts, letter writing (pen pals), weekly readers, and oral and written activities.

(Wilkinson 1964, pp. 285)

Melis (1964) surveyed, by questionnaire, the approaches to teaching reading in two content areas--science and social studies--used by 177 elementary teachers in a county in Illinois. He found that "good" reading practices (based on judgments of experts) were used more frequently at successively higher grade levels and were more commonly used in social studies teaching than in science teaching. Neither years of experience nor advanced training were significantly related to differences in frequency of use of good reading practices.

Wade (1965) studied changes in social studies programs in the public schools of the U.S. from the fifties to the early sixties by examining the recommendations made in curriculum guides. In regard to teaching practices, she found that both in the fifties and the early sixties guides commonly recommended "unit teaching" for integrating content and providing for individual differences. Unlike the guides of the fifties, a few of the new guides that appeared in the early sixties recommended implementing team teaching and many guides of that period recommended studying team teaching. Three methods that had been considered new in the 1950s were commonly recommended in the new guides appearing between 1958 and 1963: teaching skills of and providing opportunities for individual research; problem solving; and teaching skills in critical thinking, decision making, and self-direction. Many 1958-1963 guides suggested making wider use of resources that had not been used or recommended for use widely in the past: library resources, community facilities, and audiovisual teaching aids. Also, some of the new guides recommended "in-depth" teaching--selecting fewer issues and teaching them in depth rather than covering a huge amount of information. (Wade 1965, pp. 181-83)

Classroom Interaction and Questioning. No status studies on this topic for this period were located.

Grouping. Campbell (1964) surveyed U.S. secondary schools offering advanced placement courses in American history during 1963. The following table presents his findings in regard to the amount of class time devoted to various types of activities:

Table 16

PERCENT OF CLASS TIME DEVOTED TO MEANS OF INSTRUCTION

Means of Instruction	Average Percent of:		
	Advanced Placement Courses	Honors Courses	Regular Courses
Lecture	35	37	34
Discussion	48	43	47
Committee or small group	8	11	7
Supervised study or reading	6	7	9
Other	3	2	3
Totals	100	100	100

(Campbell 1964, p. 213)

Campbell also found that the average class size for advanced placement American hsitory courses was 16.7 students compared with 24 for honors classes and 26 for regular courses. Campbell's survey offered the following table in regard to testing practices:

Table 17

TEST EVALUATION

Means of Instruction	Average Percent of:		
	Advanced Placement Courses	Honors Courses	Regular Courses
Objective	22	33	52
Essay	76	66	47
Other	2	1	1
Total	100	100	100

(Campbell 1964, p. 213)

Campbell included some comments on materials usage in his study. He noted that

72 percent of the advanced placement respondents used a basic textbook and that all but three of the texts reported were college level. This compared with 78 percent for honors and 84 percent for regular courses. Top ranked among supplementary materials used for all three kinds of courses were "special studies or accounts." Audiovisual aids were utilized less in advanced placement than in honors or regular courses. Campbell found that, despite the recommendation of the Advanced Placement Program that teachers be relieved of a portion of their regular teaching schedule to prepare for the advanced placement course, only 32 percent of respondents indicated any modification of the teaching schedule. Typically, when schedules were modified, they relieved the teacher of one period per day.

Wade (1965) found in her survey of state and local curriculum guides that some form of grouping into basic or terminal programs for slow learners and into specialized courses for superior students was commonly recommended in all senior high and many junior high guides that came out between 1958 and 1963. This practice had not been commonly recommended in earlier social studies guides.

Evaluation Practices. Lux's study (1962) presented rankings of the use of various evaluative activities. Objective examinations and essay examinations ranked highest for both superior and nonsuperior teachers.

Use of Materials. Lux's study (1962) also presented information on the use of various audiovisual activities. Bulletin board displays, films, puctures, and map exercises were widely used by his respondents.

Gandy (1965) also asked his respondents (38 high school geography teachers in California) about the availability and use of various kinds of audiovisual equipment. His findings are shown in the table below (from p. 76 of his article):

Table 18

AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT: FREQUENCY OF USE AS REPORTED BY A SELECTED SAMPLING OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Audio-visual Equipment	Often	Used Occasionally	Seldom
a.	16 mm film projector	23	10	5
b.	35 mm slide projector	9	11	18
c.	Opague projector	2	2	34
d.	Tape recorder	3	4	31
e.	33 mm film strip projector	9	8	21
f.	Recordings	5	7	26
g.	Television	0	0	38

Table 19

RATINGS OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL SUPPLY FOR GEOGRAPHY INSTRUCTION AS REPORTED BY A SELECTED SAMPLING OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL GEOGRAPHY TEACHERS

	Instructional Materials	Scarce	Adequate	Plentiful
a.	Wall maps	16	13	9
b.	Globes	13	19	6
c.	Outline maps	16	12	10
d.	Map drawing materials and instruments	35	2	1
e.	Plastic relief maps	31	6	1
f.	Pictures	28	7	3
g.	Objects	37	0	1
h.	Atlases	18	18	2

Palmer (1965) discussed the use of self-instructional materials, including both computerized and noncomputerized materials. He stated that they constituted the most spectacular challenge to the textbook at that time and had grown rapidly in popularity during the past few years. However, production and use of programmed materials in the social studies lagged far behind that in other fields. In 1962, only seven social studies programs were available from commercial publishers and, in 1963, of the schools using programmed materials, 61 percent were using them in math as compared to only three percent in social studies.

Lea (1964) studied the differences in characteristics and social studies materials usage of two groups of intermediate-grade teachers. One group had indicated on a questionnaire that they employed a wide variety of methods and materials regularly in their teaching while the other group had indicated the lowest frequency of use in a variety of materials and methods of all the teachers surveyed. Both groups used reading materials to a much greater extent than other forms of materials to teach social studies. The two groups did not differ as much in the type of material that they used as in the amount they used. Neither group made much use of free or inexpensive material or current materials such as magazines, newspapers, radio, or television. Some differences in training for the teaching profession and use of support services (e.g., inservice training, professional literature, and district supervisor services) were found between the two groups. (Although it is not relevant to the state-of-practices picture we are drawing here, another finding of this study is worth noting: pupils of the first group showed significantly higher achievement gains on some measures than pupils of the second group, although on other measures there were no significant differences. Also, more pupils in the first group than in the second had positive attitudes toward the social studies.)

Wade's examination (1965) of changes in social studies curriculum guides from the fifties through 1963 indicated that the later guides recommended wider use of resources that had not been utilized in the past, including library resources, community facilities, and audiovisual teaching aids. Television was frequently mentioned as a teaching device, although direct recommendations for its immediate use were less frequent than suggestions to study its potential.

Administrative Practices. Palmer (1965) reported one study of a sample of California high schools that found that 73 percent of the districts responding had no stated guidelines for textbook selection. "Many teachers and administrators stated that the textbooks selected had not been carefully examined, and that the selection process had little relation to the program of curriculum development" (p. 157).

Practices: 1965-69

Types of Instructional Activities. Girault and Cox (1967) noted one study of ninth-grade teachers and students in Detroit that found that the amount of homework given and the value placed upon it tended to vary directly with the median income of the area in which the school was located. The study found no differences between the use of written and nonwritten homework assignments.

Skretting and Sundeen noted in 1969 that traditional teacher-led discussion based on textbook assignments was still the dominant instructional mode in the social studies.

Wood (1966) surveyed 420 high school social studies teachers in Missouri and found, among other things, that the instructional methods most often used by these teachers were "teacher--entered, i.e., question-answer recitation, teacher-led class discussion, and lecture" (Abstract).

Cottrell (1967) found that team teaching was a relatively new development in the social studies at the time he did his dissertation. He surveyed 75 high schools, teaching teams were composed primarily of experienced teachers and in half the cases nonprofessional assistance was used. The most frequently used scheduling arrangement was to assign students to two large groups, two small groups too large for the use of discussion techniques, and give only limited emphasis to independent study projects. More emphasis seemed to be placed upon administrative and teacher benefits than upon student benefits of team teaching by the respondents to Cottrell's questionnaire.

Godwin (1967) studied instructional practices in Nebraska elementary school social studies programs. He found that "most of the elementary teachers were using the traditional approach in teaching social studies" and only employing a limited number of learning activities and experiences.

Clubok (1969) interviewed 12th-grade civics steachers in Detroit to learn about their use of methods and techniques to foster critical thinking. Out of the total number of civics teachers in Detroit (50), 48 agreed to participate. Clubok found that teachers of higher-ability classes are no more likely to stress the objective of critical thinking and use methods to foster critical thinking. Only nine teachers stressed this goal, according to an overall rating by the investigator; these nine were more likely to have stated that critical thinking was one of thier basic goals than those who were rated lower; they were more likely to be using materials in ways aimed as fostering critical thinking; they made more use of suspended judgment; and they were more likely to be using the problems approach or the scientific method in their teaching.

Reynolds (1969) surveyed 113 teachers from 31 schools in East Tennessee regarding their classroom practices and problems. He found that role playing was used frequently but only a few teachers used simulations and games. Only a minority used inquiry and interdisciplinary approaches. Greater emphasis was reported in the use of concepts from economics, anthropology, and international affairs. Case studies employing original documents and primary sources were used only rarely. Although history teachers were giving more attention than in the past to political, sociological, and economic history, they still followed a chronological approach.

Blesh (1969) compared the actual classroom practices of social studies teachers in Texas elementary schools with the practices recommended by two authority groups--a national group of social studies specialists and college and university professors of elementary education in Texas institutions. He found close agreement between the actual practices and the recommendations of the authority groups. Unfortunately, his abstract does not give details on the kinds of practices used and their frequency of use.

Instruction in contemporary affairs was the subject of Kane's dissertation (1969). He surveyed 301 secondary social studies teachers in Orange County, California. They reported they spent an average of 31 to 50 minutes per week on instruction in contemporary affairs. Almost three-fourths reported integrating this into their daily lessons. Over 90 percent included contemporary affairs items on their tests. They made only infrequent use of TV and radio but frequent use of films and filmstrips and a wide variety of newspapers and magazines.

Classroom Interaction and Questioning. Cox, Johnson, and Payette (1968) noted one study of 14 fifth-grade teachers randomly assigned to above-average, average, and below-average social studies classes. Using the OSCAR system, outside observers determined the amount of use of listening, speaking, reading, and writing activities. Speaking and listening accounted for 79 percent of lesson time, reading and writing, 17 percent. There were differences in the kinds of activities according to ability level. The Flanders system was used to observe verbal interaction. It was found that teachers of more able students used more indirect instruction, were more democratic, and allowed more student-centered activities.

Cox, Johnson, and Payette (1968) also reported a study of questioning by teachers in 44 social studies classes. Almost all questions were at the memory, translation, or interpretation level (the latter two combined are the same as

Bloom's comprehension level). The investigators characterized the intellectual atmosphere of the classes as "meager."

Schreiber (1967) observed 14 fifth-grade social studies teachers in Illinois and Iowa to learn what kinds of questions were asked in what kinds of lessons. Factual recall questions were the most prevalent; other prevalent types were questions that called for a statement of judgment based on personal experiences, speculation on outcomes, and uncovering information and raising questions for study. Question types that were used to varying degrees by different teachers included ones that called for describing situations, making comparisons, identifying main parts of materials, identifying supporting facts, and using maps. Little-used question types included those that called for arranging information in sequential order, defining and clarifying information, drawing conclusions, evaluating quality of source materials, and evaluating adequacy of data. The types of questions varied with the types of lessons taught. Question types most frequently used in introductory lessons called for factual recall, using maps, stating judgments based on personal experiences, speculating on outcomes, and uncovering information and raising questions for study. During development lessons an increase was noted in questions calling for defining and clarifying information and drawing conclusions. Review lessons saw an increase in questions calling for arranging information in sequential order, giving descriptions, making comparisons, and identifying the main parts of materials.

Another questioning study, by Godbold (1968), involved 32 teachers in elementary and junior high schools in Dade County, Florida. Half of the teachers had five years or more experience and the other half two years or less. At least half the questions asked by all four experience/grade-level groups fell into the memory category and categories above interpretation were most neglected in all four groups. Elementary teachers (both the more experienced and the less experienced) asked significantly more questions than secondary teachers and differed significantly from the secondary teachers in the kinds of questions they asked. The more experienced secondary teachers asked significantly more questions than did the less experienced secondary teachers and there was also a significant difference between these two groups in the kinds of questions they asked.

Kysilka (1969) did an observational study of the verbal teaching behavior of 24 mathematics and social studies teachers in the eighth and eleventh grades, using the OSCAR 5V categories. Math teachers were found to use more convergent questions, procedural-positive questions, describing statements, and directing statements than social studies teachers. Social studies teachers used more divergent questions and desisting statements than math teachers. Students in social studies classes used more nonsubstantive statements than in math classes and volunteered substantive information more frequently than in math classes. The proportion of pupil-initiated statements to teacher statements was significantly greater in social studies than in math classes. Social studies teachers rejected student responses more often than did math teachers. Math teachers talked significantly more than social studies teachers. Social studies teachers asked a significantly greater proportion of divergent than convergent questions than did math teachers. Eighth-grade teachers used more directing statements than did 11th-grade teachers.

Grouping. Splittgerber (1966) surveyed 337 senior high schools in eight midwestern states to find out the degree to which social studies content and instructional techniques were being differentiated for students of varying abilities. Out of 273 responding schools, 137 grouped their social studies classes. The most common approach was to group students into three levels. However, the schools generally did not make effective provisions for differentiating instruction among these three levels. Teachers tried to individualize instruction by altering the depth and comprehensiveness in treatment of subject matter instead of providing content unique to each ability level. Most schools were more concerned with the mechanics of the grouping program than with coordinating and planning instructional provisions. Also, because teachers mostly specialized in history, they often were not able to provide enrichment experiences in courses not directly related to history. Students of average ability, particularly, were given little challenge, encouragement, or motivation.

Joekel (1966), in a dissertation study parallel to that of Splittgerber, examined grouping practices in 484 junior high schools. Sixty-eight percent of the schools employed grouping in social studies. Few social studies teachers differentiated significantly in the organization, the methods, the materials, the evaluation techniques, the content, the group and individual activities, or the audiovisual materials employed for the various ability levels. There were no significant differences in the background preparation of the teachers of grouped classes; there was little evaluation of grouping; and supplementary materials in library and classroom appeared to be in short supply.

Uphoff (1967) surveyed 100 senior high schools throughout the nation and found that grouping was practiced in most of the schools. However, few courses appeared to be specifically designed for the low achiever. Required subjects were often taught at three levels, with one level being designated for low achievers. Elective courses, on the other hand, were usually only taught at one level and rarely for the low achiever. Low achiever sections differed from other sections of courses in emphasizing special vocabulary and reading-level materials, slower pace, less depth and more limited range of content, reading development, fewer pupils per class, teaching techniques aimed at the abilities and interests of the pupils, and lower expectations for the pupils.

Codwin (1967) and Saunders (1968) both found that less than half of the elementary teachers in Nebraska practices grouping of students during social studies instruction.

Larkin (1969) surveyed administrators, teachers, and students in 13 schools in Indiana during 1968-69 to learn about independent study practices. Independent study opportunities in Indiana Junior high schools appared most frequently in the "basic skill" areas (English, social studies, mathematics, and science). Most of the junior high schools that had independent study programs did not use additional mateirals and equipment extensively. The programs were organized for a select group of students. Few of the schools supplemented the programs with large-group and small-group instruction. Decisions in these programs were made cooperatively by students and teachers.

Draper (1970) studied the advanced placement American history programs in Illinois secondary schools in 1969. He found, among other things, that resource individuals, panel discussions,and simulations were given little consideration by teachers in these programs.

Skretting and Sundeen's review (1969) reported that the most commonly used arrangements for fast learners were ability grouping, specialized classes, enrichment within regular classes, and advanced placement programs.

Reviewers Johnson, Payette, and Cox (1969) noted a survey of junior and senior high schools that found that three-quarters employed ability grouping and only 3.6 percent were trying nongraded approaches.

Evaluation Practices. Godwin (1967) surveyed 190 Nebraska elementary teachers and found, among other things, that they were only using a limited number of evaluation techniques. Saunders (1968) surveyed a different sample of Nebraska elementary teachers, totalling 216, and found the same thing.

Poetker (1971) examined social studies test items in six college admissions examinations. Of the 450 items examined, 82 percent measured recall or recognition of knowledge, 18 percent measured reading comprehension, and none attempted to measure student abilities in the remaining (higher) levels of Bloom's taxonomy. The test items dealt predominantly with history and rarely with social sciences, were not concerned with non-Western or contemporary history, and were not concerned with forms of knowledge such as knowledge of methods of inquiry. In sum, Poetker concluded that "admission examinations emphasize low level conceptual learnings and that the examinations are inappropriate in relationship to the kinds of secondary social studies curricula being recommended by social studies educators" (Abstract).

Use of Materials. The pair of Nebraska elementary studies mentioned previously (Godwin 1967 and Saunders 1968) also inquired about use of materials and equipment. Godwin reported that over one-half of the 190 teachers in his sample never used television; that there appeared to be a shortage of instructional media in the classroom; and that the teachers were only using a limited number of media. Saunders reported that the majority of her 216 teachers had access to audiovisual equipment and over half of them were using the equipment to a substantial degree. Over half the teachers were using a variety of instructional materials, with intermediate-grade teachers using a wider variety than primary-grade teachers. Over half the teachers never used eduacational television pertaining to the social studies.

Kane's (1969) study of contemporary affairs instruction in high school social studies classes in Calfiornia determined that teachers made frequent use of films and filmstrips, as well as a wide variety of newspapers and magazines, in teaching contemporary affairs.

Reynolds dissertation (1969) on social studies practices in secondary schools in East Tennessee found extremely limited use of programmed materials, multiple texts, and materials for various reading levels. Most of the 113 teachers said that the new textbooks that had been adopted were in line with what they thought ought to be emphasized in the social studies.

Kimball (1970) reported the responses of nearly 3,000 juniors and seniors who completed a questionnaire in conjunction with taking the American history and social studies test or the European and world cultures test of the College Entrance Examination Board in 1965-66. Less than one-fourth of the students said they had dealt with interpretation of graphs and charts more than a few times in their courses and students from independent and catholic schools reported less experience with these types of materials than did students from public schools. Only a small percentage of students--and these were not from the public school category--reported their American history course had not used a textbook. The students were asked to indicate which text they had used; their responses indicated a wide diversity, with no one text predominating, although three texts were used by about half the students. Over three-quarters of the students read more than 100 pages in addition to the text and over half read in excess of 500 additional pages. More than one-fifth remembered reading at least five extra books; one-fifth had not done any additional reading.

Administrative Practices. Johnson, Payette, and Cox (1969) mentioned one study of junior and senior high schools that found that more than one-quarter conducted block-time programs, usually composed of language arts and social studies. Also, the same study found that about 12 percent of the schools used team teaching in social studies.

Psencik (1970) reported on a 1969 survey of state social studies specialists. The number of state social studies specialists had increased dramatically since Title III NDEA funds became available in the mid-sixties. By 1967 there were 68 elementary and secondary social studies specialists in the 50 states and district of Columbia. This had increased to 77 by the time of Psencik's questionnaire. Of the 77 specialists, 67 returned questionnaires.

Only six states remained without any social studies specialists and one state had as many as seven. Most states (33) had only one specialist. States with two or more specialists totaled 12; four states reported five or more specialists.

Sixty-two of the 67 respondents devoted full time to social studies, while The remaining five divided their time between social studies and other curriculum areas. Actual supervision typically occupied only a small percentage (eight percent) of the specialists' time. Consulting accounted for 32 percent; administrative duties occupies 13 percent; and the remaining 47 percent was given to duties such as curriculum materials development (14 percent), inservice course development (six percent), conducting owrkshops (14 percent), developing bulletins and newsletters (three percent), working with teacher education institutions (four percent), textbook adoptions (two percent), and other duties such as work on NDEA and ESEA projects, evaluation, task force or special assignments, and testing programs (four percent).

Fifty-five of the respondents had responsibility for grades K-12, ten for secondary level, and two, elementary level. Sixty were responsible for their entire state, while seven were responsible for some portion of their state. Four were assigned to specific social science areas, while 63 worked with all the social science disciplines.

Thirty-three states reported having local district social studies supervisors in at least some districts, and seven reported having none. Fifteen of the 33 states with local supervisors reported such personnel were in five percent or fewer of their local districts; only four states reported local specialists in more than 25 percent of their districts.

Psencik also gave data on the educational background and work experience of state supervisors, as well as salary levels.

Practices: 1970-75

Types of Instructional Activities. Gross (1977) reported that two California studies found that teachers said they were using the approaches associated with the "new social studies," particularly "inquiry," "conceptual," "broad-field," and "simulation-game" approaches. State specialists queried by Gross also reported that teaching styles have been "materially influenced" by the projects; over three-quarters of them believed this was clearly apparent at the secondary level and about 60 percent thought their impact had been average to great at the elementary level. However, one of the California studies found that, "in spite of the fact that the bulk of the high school teachers claimed that they are employing the methodology of the new social studies, over 70 percent of the sampling admitted little direct teaching of skill development" (p. 199). Gross comments, "one way or another, at least the terminology of the new social studies has percolated to the teachers. Yet we have conflicting evidence as to actual practice" (p. 200). (More information, from Gross as well as other sources, on the impact of the "new social studies" may be found in Section 4.0.)

In the fall of 1976, a survey of the 440 self-selected members of the nationwide Curriculum Information Network (CIN) was conducted (Morrissett 1977). The purpose was to learn which of five approaches to the teaching of social studies was preferred. The five approaches were described as follows:

1. History as the major and/or integrating focus of study; emphasis on sound knowledge and understanding of the past as a guide to good citizenship.
2. Using experiences of students as the basis for initiating and guiding their learning experiences; emphasis on the developmental needs of the learner.
3. Reflective or critical thinking or inquiry; emphasis on the processes of thinking and on examination of both facts and values.
4. Using the content and structure of the social sciences; emphasis on the concepts, generalizations, and modes of inquiry of the social sciences.

> 5. Analysis of and active involvement in social and political issues; emphasis on analysis of facts and values and on taking positions on social issues. (Morrissett 1977, p. 206)

The respondents indicated their own order of preference as follows:

Critical thinking: 29% first preference, 32% second preference

Social science: 28% first preference, 23% second preference

History: 20% first preference, 12% second preference

They also indicated what they thought were the preferences of three social studies teachers they "knew best." The order resulting was this:

History: 39% first preference, 19% second preference

Critical thinking: 23% first preference, 26% second preference

Social science: 22% first preference, 25% second preference

Their opinions of the most frequently used approaches for the nation were the following:

History: 72% first preference, 12% second preference

Social science: 14% first preference, 35% second preference

Critical thinking: 6% first preference, 24% second preference

Thus, while only 20 percent of respondents indicated history as their first preference, they believed that over 70 percent of all social studies teachers gave first preference to history. All subgroups identified (senior high teachers, department chairpersons, junior high teachers, college teachers, consultants and supervisors, elementary teachers, and administrators) were in substantial agreement about the prevalence of history as the dominant approach in the nation. The summary figures are shown in the table below:

Table 20

REPORTED PREFERENCES FOR FIVE APPROACHES
ALL RESPONDENTS

	You			Three others			United States		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. History	20%	12%	15%	39%	19%	13%	72%	12%	9%
2. Experience	11	18	21	8	17	21	5	16	17
3. Critical Thinking	29	32	18	23	26	24	6	24	32
4. Social science	28	23	23	22	25	23	14	35	23
5. Involvement	12	15	23	8	13	19	3	13	19
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Responses	521	451	348	463	458	337	331	304	280

(Morrissett 1977, p. 207)

National Assessment for Educational Progress's Bicentennial Survey (Education for Citizenship . . . 1976) presented some data from a national sample of 13- and 17-year-olds on practices in their civics classes and schools.

--88% of both ages gave positive responses to a question about whether students are encouraged to make up their own minds.

--82% of the 13-year-olds and 90% of the 17-year-olds agreed that "teachers try to get students to speak freely and openly in class."

--75% of the 13-year-olds and 82% of the 17-year-olds felt that students could feel free to disagree openly with their teachers.

--85% at both ages agreed that their teachers respected their opinions and encouraged them to express them.

--69% of the 13-year-olds and 72% of the 17-year-olds said that they participated in making decisions about school affairs at least sometimes.

--63% of the 17-year-olds said they had discussions on national, state, and local government and politics in their classes at least three or four times per month, while only 48% of the 13-year-olds said they did.

--61% of the 17-year-olds and 46% of the 13-year-olds said they had discussions about international politics and global problems at least three or four times per month.

Remy (1972) reported that, of a national though unrepresentative sample of high school seniors (consisting primarily of middle-class, college-bound students), 22 percent indicated they had had a course in civics and government where, as part of the course, they participated in "real" political and/or community activities.

Classroom Interaction and Questioning. Surprisingly, only one study on classroom interaction and no studies on questioning practices were found for this period. The classroom interaction study, however, was one of the more interesting attempts to determine the nature and extent of actual classroom practice. Carter (1971) investigated the way in which teachers in public schools were handling explanations of social phenomena. He identified 78 requests for explanation from tape recordings of social studies classes (the grade levels were not specified in the abstract). There was an average of .83 requests for explanations per class period. Forty-nine percent of the class periods were without any request for explanation and 22 percent of the teachers produced 78 percent of the requested explanations. Three problem areas were identified: "cueing" of the explanation (cueing statements did not clearly indicate the type of explanation desired); completion of explanations (explanations were not completed in many cases); and testing of explanations (neither explanations offered by teachers nor explanations offered by students were challenged).

Grouping. No studies dealing with grouping practices for this period were located.

Evaluation Practices. No studies of evaluation practices commonly employed in this period were found.

Use of Materials. There were several studies for this period on the extent of use of "new social studies" classrooms. These are reported in the section on "new social studies."

In addition, an observation made by an editor of a textbook publishing house and presumably based on industry sales data is worth noting: "Remember the widespread talk and prediction about how programmed instruction was going to 'revolutionize' education? Publishers lost millions of dollars preparing materials for a market that never materialized." (Edgerton 1969, p. 286)

Administrative Practices. No surveys of administrative practices for this period were found.

Miscellany. One study on teachers' use of instructional objectives was located. Michelli (1972) surveyed 15 teachers of U.S. history in four secondary schools in New Jersey. He found that only one respondent was able to provide evidence that he prepared instructional objectives regularly. Most of the sample objectives that respondents submitted were statements of content to be covered. No behavioral objectives were submitted. Inservice training, school policies regarding planning, supervision, and use of planning periods were not supportive of the teachers' use of instructional objectives and there was little in the teachers' backgrounds to encourage their use of objectives.

Summary Observations

1) Studies on the extent of use of various practices (for instance, lecture, small-group discussion, essay tests, tracking, curriculum specialists' services) are not numerous. We located fewer than 50, most of which were doctoral dissertations.

2) It can be safely said that we know very little about what were the most commonly used classroom practices in social studies throughout the U.S. at any particular time during the last 20 years. We know virtually nothing about commonly used administrative practices in the social studies. We can make very few, if any, well-founded statements about trends over that period in practices. And, we can make very few claims about national patterns, although a few states (such as California and Nebraska) seem to have been fairly well studied in some time periods.

3) The studies on classroom practices in the social studies that could be located dealt mainly with the following areas: types of instructional activities, classroom interaction and questioning patterns, grouping, evaluation, and use of materials.

4) A number of surveys of the extent of use of various types of instructional activities were located for each of the first three periods (six for 1955-59; six for 1960-64; and nine for 1964-69). Almost all of these surveys focused on specific techniques, such as lecture, discussion, map work, group projects, field trips, and workbook assignments. Although any generalization from these diverse studies must be considered tentative, it would appear that class discussion was the most favored teaching technique; that a sizeable proportion of teachers employed multiple techniques; and that field trips would have to be counted among the least used instructional activities. Lectures were used fairly frequently by the teachers surveyed; but, if those teachers' self-reports are to be believed, this technique of instruction was not nearly so pervasive as professional mythology would have us believe. On the other hand, the exact nature of the popularly-used discussion technique is not usually specified in the studies, but there is some reason to believe that such discussions were largely teacher-centered.

5) The studies on extent of use of instructional activities during the most recent period (1970-75) are quite different from the earlier surveys (except for one survey in 1969). Rather than asking respondents about use of discrete techniques in isolation, the more recent studies seek information of a more global nature--about preferred "approaches" to the teaching of social studies. These surveys have been shaped by the "new social studies" and are primarily concerned with whether teachers are using the whole constellation of techniques, philosophy, and content associated with the "new social studies " The findings, however, are not clear. Certainly, they do not yield information that can be compared with the earlier "technique" studies to show us trends.

6) The surveys of extent of use of types of instructional activities typically employed written questionnaires and sometimes interviews, but not observational techniques. All called for self-reports of teachers, or, in a very few cases, estimates of teachers' practices by supervisors or others.

7) There have been, on the other hand, some observational studies of patterns of classroom interaction and questioning in the social studies. Unfortunately, these are very few and were conducted almost wholly during 1965-69. None were located for the two earliest periods. Generalization from these studies is not appropriate at this point.

8) Surveys of grouping practices in social studies were rather popular during the period 1965-69. These studies focused on what has been called "tracking," that is, assigning students to separate classes depending on level of ability. Hardly any attention has been given to grouping practices within single classrooms. The grouping studies have generally found that the major differences among various levels or tracks are in the amount and depth of content covered and the reading level of materials used.

9) Several studies surveying evaluation practices have been conducted over the last 20 years. These surveys generally show that social studies teachers are not sophisticated about evaluation; do not like it ("wish it would go away"); are generally quite uninventive in regard to evaluation, using only a limited number of techniques (objective and essay

tests, participation in class discussion, and student papers); and tend to ignore all but content objectives in evaluation of students.

10) Most surveys of classroom instructional practices in the three early periods asked about the kinds of materials (and sometimes equipment) used by social studies teachers. These studies were concerned about the varieties of formats of materials used (that is, use of newspapers, film-strips, novels, maps and globes, transparencies, and the like, in addition to the basic textbook). Although the results of these earlier surveys are mixed, it would appear that only about a quarter of social studies teachers used a wide variety of materials to supplement the text.

11) In the most recent period, several studies focusing exclusively on materials usage have been conducted. However, instead of surveying the use of various formats of materials, these studies have explored the use of specific curriculum packages associated with the "new social studies." These packages usually contained a wide variety of materials integrated into a coordinated program. The surveys indicate that, overall, the "new social studies" materials are not in wide use, although it should be kept in mind that what constitutes "wide use" is open to debate. There have been no recent surveys comparable to the earlier ones, focusing on variety of formats of materials employed in social studies instruction.

12) The literature surveying administrative practices, such as scheduling, support services from curriculum specialists, and released time for teachers, is quite spotty and no generalizations are possible.

1.4 The State of Social Studies Curriculum Materials

This section examines the state of curriculum materials for the social studies during the 20-year period under study, 1955-1975. It is largely based on content analyses of social studies textbooks and curriculum packages, K-12, done during that period. (The few available analyses of supplementary materials, such as simulations/games, media kits, and readings books have been excluded, since the intent was to obtain a picture of the core of what was being conveyed through materials.)

A total of 161 studies analyzing the content of social studies materials was found. ("Content analysis" is used here in the loose sense and includes not only quantitative studies using word and space counts but also less precise, though still systematic, reviews and comparisons of materials.) This is a considerable number of studies, especially compared to the limited amount of attention other areas of concern to social studies educators (such as experimental research on inquiry methods and surveys of the state of classroom practices) have received. Some have criticized what appears to them to be a relatively fruitless and certainly excessive fixation on analysis of texts (for instance, Metcalf 1963). However, there are at least two good reasons for devoting at least some effort to surveying the content of social studies materials.

First, what is contained in textbooks is thought to be a prime determinant and indicator of what gets taught to students and how it is taught. For instance, Davison et al. (1975) stated, "Research shows that approximately 80 percent of all curricular decisions are made on the basis of a text" (p. 32). Unfortuantely, they do not give a reference for this rather dramatic claim, so we cannot judge its validity. Nevertheless, the belief in the centrality of the textbook is echoed by many other social studies eudcators and it is not stretching credibility to assume that the contents of textbooks are at least a major determinant of what is presented to learners. Thus, an examination of content will give us strong indications of what students are taught across the nation.

A second reason for analyzing the contents of textbooks is to systematize information about individual texts in a way that facilitates comparison and selection for use. That is, clear presentations of systematic information about available texts aid district personnel in choosing materials appropriate for their situations. This type of analysis results in an end-product somewhat different from analysis designed to accomplish the goal mentioned in the previous paragraph. In the first type of analysis, the object is to generalize across many materials characterizing the whole; whereas in this second kind of analysis, the object is to differentiate. Also, in the first type of analysis, usually a few dimensions are chosen for close analysis; while in the second type, many dimensions (including information about prices and the like as well as about content) are analyzed.

Although NSF's interest here is in the first type of analysis, a number of the second type have been included since they do contain relevant information and some have attempted in at least limited ways to present generalizations about materials.

The discussion that follows is divided into two parts. The first part is a set of four tables. Tables 21-23 summarize important aspects of Appendix Table A-5, the basic data source of an overview of the 161 content analyses. Table A-5 breaks down the 161 studies by topics analyzed and by time period. For each study, the author, reporting format (e.g., dissertation, journal article, monograph), date, type(s) of text(s) examined, number of texts examined, and grade level(s) are given. The summary tables (21-23) give total numbers by period for reporting format (dissertation vs. other forms), grade level, and topic analyzed.

The second part of the discussion examines in detail the analysis topic of particular interest to NSF: the treatment of social science content and methods in K-12 social studies curriculum materials. In this part, the findings of 43 studies are summarized. It should be noted that social science content and methods appears to be one of the three most-analyzed aspects of social studies materials, along with the categories of treatment of minorities and treatment of specific concepts and themes.

Before proceeding to the two major parts of this review section, mention should be made of a few other matters relevant to the state of curriculum materials. First, information on the extent of use of various kinds of materials--which might logically have been presented in this section--is treated in two other sections of this report: subsection on the state of instructional and administrative practices (1.3) and the section on the "new social studies" (4.0).

Second, it has been claimed that there has been a great increase in the variety of materials available for use in social studies over the last decade or so--variety of media variety of content, and variety of instructional approach. It has been suggested, for instance, that prior to the intervention of the federal government with funding for "new social studies" projects, the idea of local control was virtually a myth; textbooks of different publishers for any given grade level were quite similar; but the "new social studies" (together with other factors, possibly) broke this homogeneity and now, in fact, the problem is curriculum fragmentation and bewilderment over the coufusing array of materials from which to choose. Unfortunately, we have found absolutely no "hard data" (or even any "soft data" other than vague impressions) to substantiate the claim that there is actually greater variety now. However, neither have we found data showing there has not been an increase in variety.

Third, a number of articles have been written on the state of the social studies textbook publishing industry. While interesting, these articles do not contribute much systematic data to help us understand why social studies materials are the way they are. They are, however, a good source of testable hypotheses and should be consulted by anyone planning to study the role of the publishing industry in social studies education. (A good starting point would be the articles appearing in the March 1969 issue of Social Education.)

Finally, information on money--amounts available to districts for purchase of social studies texts, costs of development and production for publishers and projects--would be useful; but it is very hard to dig out, especially for social studies alone. What few tidbits I found were scattered hither and thither in a number of articles.

Sources

The 161 studies on which this section is based were identified through the following sources:

-- manual search of the Education Index, June 1955 through June 1970 (The Index was not searched beyond June 1970, since by that time

ERIC/ChESS had been established and was covering both journal and other types of literature in social studies education.)

- computer search of the ERIC system, including both Current Index to Journals in Education and Resources in Education, from 1966 to present
- computer search of Dissertation Abstracts since 1973
- manual search of three comprehensive compilations of social studies dissertations, covering period 1955 through 1973 (McPhie 1964; Gross and De La Cruz 1971; Chapin 1974)
- computer search of Sociological Abstracts, 1955 to present
- computer search of Psychological Abstracts, 1955 to present
- search of a bibliography of research and commentary on textbooks (Finkelstein et al. 1969)
- search of a chapter of a book reviewing research on curriculum materials (Palmer 1965)
- search of all comprehensive reviews of research in social studies since 1955, particularly that of Ehman (1977)
- search of several SSEC and ERIC/ChESS state-of-the-art papers on the precollege teaching of the social science disciplines.

Documentation and Discussion

Overview of 157 Content Analyses

The following tables present an overall picture of the kinds of content analyses that have been done with social studies curriculum materials over the last two decades. Table 21 summarizes the number and type of analyses. Table 22 summarizes the grade levels of materials on which analyses were done. Table 23 summarizes the various aspects of materials that were analyzed (e.g., treatment of minorities, treatment of social science content). In Appendix Table A-5, the master table, is listed all the materials analyses done in the period 1955-1975 and their key characteristics are given.

Table 21

Summary: Number and Type of Studies

	1955-59	1960-64	1965-69	1970-74	1975-76	Total
Total Number of Studies	16	24	49	56	15*	161
Number of Dissertations	9	10	21	25	2	67
Dissertations as Percent of Total	56%	40%	43%	45%	13%	42%

Table 22

Summary: Grade Levels**

	1955-59	1960-64	1965-69	1970-74	1975-76*	Total
Elementary (K-6)	8	9	19	24	10	70
Jr. High (7-9)	3	6	14	18	9	50
Sr. High (10-12)	5	8	21	35	10	79
Not Known	1	11	8	6	0	26

Table 23

Summary: Aspects Analyzed ***

	1955-59	1960-64	1965-69	1970-74	1975-76	Total
Social Science	4	7	14	13	5	43****
General	2	0	3	2	0	8
Anthropology	0		0	1	2	
Economics	0	1	4	6	2	8
Geography	2	2	1	0	0	5
Political Science	0	0	5	3	1	9
Psychology	0	1	1	1	0	3
Sociology	0	1	2	0	0	3
(Subtotal 46)****						
Specific Concepts and Themes	6	6	10	13	3	38
History	0	3	4	2	0	9
Epistemology and Learning Theory	1	0	6	1	0	8
Social Studies--Unspecified or General	0	0	3	1	0	4
Minorities	0	7	10	16	3	36
Foreign Areas	1	2	3	4	4	14
Objectives	0	1	1	2	0	4
Illustrations, etc.	0	1	1	1	0	3
Readability	3	2	2	2	0	9
Multiple Aspects	0	0	0	4	1*	5
Unclear	0	0	0	1	0	1

*These figures do not include the SSEC Data Book, which continues to publish analyses every six months. The Data Book is counted only once, in the period 1970-74, in which it first appeared (1971).

**Some studies are counted at more than one level since they crossed levels. Hence the total column adds up to more than 161.

***Some studies are counted in more than one category since they analyzed more than one aspect. This was done for studies that analyzed a few discrete aspects, such as "Illustrations" and "Social Studies Content." Studies attempting comprehensive analyses of many aspects--including content, objectives, and teaching strategies--and without emphasizing one over the others are, on the other hand, counted only under "Multiple Aspects."

****The total of 43 studies on social science does not match the total of 46 shown for the discipline breakdowns since some studies are counted in more than one discipline (e.g., two studies dealt both with psychology and sociology).

Analyses of Social Science Content and Social Science Methodology

In the following pages, the 43 studies analyzing treatment of social science content and methods in social studies curriculum materials are described. First studies dealing with treatment of social science in general are discussed and then studies focusing on specific disciplines are discussed, one discipline at a time.

Studies Analyzing Social Science Content and Methodology in General. Seven studies reporting the results of analyses of social science content in general (as distinguished from content of one or a few specific social sciences) were identified.

Four of these dealt with elementary social studies textbooks. Two were reports of the same piece of research. All judged that coverage of social science content (in two cases, generalizations; in one, content) was inadequate, both in quantity and quality, and all noted that the amount and quality of coverage varied greatly from one text to another.

Dimitroff's dissertation (1958) and subsequent article reporting her dissertation study (1961) examined 30 texts for grades four through six. She conducted textual analysis to determine the amount and quality of coverage of the following 15 generalizations, which were derived by a jury of scholars:

1) The foundations of successful human relations are freedom of worship along with justice before the law, equality of opportunity for self-realization, together with economic advancement, and in addition, liberty of movement, unhindered inquiry as well as unrestricted communication--all of these within the limitations of law, national security, and decency.
2) Civilization is partly dependent upon the conservation and development of human and natural resources.
3) Family living should contribute to a mature personality--the expression of the quality of emotional, mental, physical and social experience, reconstructed and integrated into his being.

4) Essential to the welfare of a dynamic, emergent democracy is significant participation of the individual in community and national citizenship.

5) The lag in the development and utilization of social inventions as compared with the widespread use of technical discoveries is a threat to human existence.

6) The direction of human affairs stems partly from the interaction among the individuals and groups.

7) In part a peaceful world depends upon the toleration of conflicting ideologies, each within its separate sphere.

8) The danger of devastating wars--wasteful of life, property, and other resources--necessitates an international organization to adjust disputes arising out of conflicting interests.

9) Interdependence of population and the wise use of resources which they share increase with the advancement of science.

10) Growth of population has resulted from utilizing science to increase longevity as well as to control and ameliorate disasters.

11) Science and technology have distinctly modified man's efficiency to utilize the resources of the earth and the significance of climate.

12) Since people must live under varied natural circumstances, human survival normally depends upon developing and adapting behavior to suit given environments.

13) Physical and cultural diversities have, in part, occasioned great economic, political, and social issues of modern times.

14) Discoveries and inventions must be shared in the interests of optimum human well-being.

15) Technological advancement increases man's opportunities for recreation and creative expression.

(Dimitroff 1961, pp. 135-36)

Generalization #11 received the greatest amount of attention in the 30 texts and #13 received the least. There were no significant differences in coverage among fused social studies, history, and geography texts. Only three of the 30 textbooks were judged adequate, using the criteria established by an earlier study of Canadian and U.S. texts. These three gave from 11 to 14 percent of their total space (both words and illustrations) to the generalizations. Non-text space (illustrations) devoted to the generalizations exceeded by far the text (word) space given to the generalizations.

Chew's dissertation (1966) examined 19 second-grade social studies texts to determine whether they provided adequate coverage of the social science generalizations included in the 1962 California Social Studies Framework. (The generalizations were not listed in her abstract.) She found that some texts gave up to 75 percent of total text (word) space and 93 percent of total nontext (illustration) space. Five of the 19 gave no space to any generalization. History generalizations (which she apparently included as social science generalizations) received the most attention and there was no attention at all to generalizations from philosophy. Chew also examined cognitive levels, following Bloom's taxonomy. All but one book had at least 50 percent of the content at the knowledge level, leaving, of course, less than 50 percent of space for higher cognitive levels.

Israel's dissertation (1970) reported on a study of fused social studies texts for grades four through six. The exact number of books examined was not mentioned in the abstract. She used John Jarolimek's list of "Organizing Ideas from the Disciplines" (no citation or list given in her abstract) as the source of social science concepts for examination. All his geography concepts were included in the books; two of his sociology concepts were entirely absent; and four other concepts received only minimal mention. Except for geography, the development of social science concepts was judged inadequate. The social science disciplines were ranked according to amount of attnetion received, from greatest to least: geography, history, anthropology, economics, political science, and sociology.

Of the three studies on secondary textbooks, one examined social science content and provisions for inquiry in American history texts and two dealt with social science content in 11th-grade American history textbooks. In the case of the latter two, the later study was explicitly designed as a follow-up to the first, to see what impact, if any, the "new social studies" had had.

Palmer (1967) examined five high school American history textbooks, selected because of their nationwide sales volume. He began his report on his findings by noting that at least one conclusion was beyond dispute--"American history textbooks are today very large and heavy" (p. 137). His other findings included the following:

1) American history textbooks were organized according to chronological sequence and, within that, content was organized under descriptive topic headings. Primary attention was given to what happened, with the prevailing style being narrative.

2) Most authors did not express any intention of promoting student inquiry; one team of authors that did express such an intention did not follow through with it in the text. Sometimes, however, the end-of-chapter teaching aids did hold potential for encouraging inquiry; but, again, in most cases, the material in the text did not support any extended examination of issues. Since the teacher had, therefore, to find outside materials, it was not likely much of the potential for inquiry would materialize.

3) Authors tended to present cause-event-consequence sequences as purely factual accounts--THE history of the U.S.--without mentioning conflicting viewpoints, explanatory hypotheses, analyses, and interpretations that might be explored in relation to the topic.

4) There was a reluctance of authors to state their assumptions and purposes. There were inadequate theoretical frameworks in all five texts.

5) There was little explicit social, political, or economic analysis as distinct from historical description, although there was much material that illustrated social science concepts and generalizations contained in the texts. Social science knowledge was not explicitly discussed in the texts. Explanations and implications of social science concepts that were introduced were rare.

Ratcliffe's dissertation (1966) examined six 11th grade American history textbooks that publishers judged to represent from 75 to 94 percent of the total market. Eighty-nine terms, signifying the "representative ideas" of the social sciences, were used in the analysis. These were derived from review of the significant works in the disciplines and the ratings of a panel of scholars. The final list of 89 terms showed the clear relationships among the social science disciplines: only 14 were not identified as basic to two or more fields; 11 were identified as representative ideas in five fields; and five terms, in all six fields. (The six fields were political science, economics, geography, sociology, social psychology, and cultural anthropology.) Of the total 30,603 mentions of the 89 terms in the six texts, only 156 usages encompassed more than mere mention of the terms. Thirty-one terms were virtually or actually ignored in the texts. Twenty-eight received adequate quantitative coverage. Political and economic terms received significantly greater quantitative treatment than others. For 45 terms, there were no explicit attempts by authors to explain, define, or otherwise clarify. Of the 44 terms receiving any qualitative treatment at all, only 20 received such in more than one of the six books. Only one term, inflation, received qualitative treatment in all six books. Overall, the attention given these representative ideas of the social sciences was judged inadequate.

Brufke (1972) specifically designed his dissertation study as a follow up to Ratcliffe's. He used three American history texts that were revised versions of texts used by Ratcliffe and three American history texts produced by the "new social studies" projects. He pared the Ratcliffe list of 89 terms down to 76. He found that all but two of the terms were treated quantitatively and two-thirds of the 76 were treated qualitatively in the texts. However, according to his abstract, "the qualitative treatment of representative terms did not increase numerically to any great degree..." It is not quite clear what this statement means, in light of the finding that two-thirds were treated qualitatively, an increase over qualitative treatment found by Ratcliffe. Brufke concluded that we still needed to improve the treatment of social science ideas in texts.

Studies Analyzing Geography Content. Two studies were done at the elementary level and three at the secondary level analyzing geographic content in textbooks.

A certain amount of "disciplinary imperialism" can be detected in the two elementary studies, for in spite of somewhat positive findings in regard to the coverage of geographic content in texts, the authors urge more attention be given to the distinct identity of the discipline.

A 1955 article by Haslem examined four sixth-grade texts to determine if the trend toward fusion (integration of history and geography) had had a detrimental effect on the amount and kind of geography portrayed. She found that the percentage of text devoted to geographic material ranged from 15.67 in one text to 40.29 in another. All four books emphasized primarily political and economic geography and "the Human factor" (the latter went undefined). Although she concluded that the four texts, overall, did a splendid job of integrating the disciplines, she stated that "it is...absolutely necessary that geography keep its identity and at no time lose it by just being a 'backdrop' for the drama of 'history' or any other subject!" (p. 453) Mensoian (1962) compared eight series of elementary (4-6) geography and fused social studies texts to determine the relative emphasis given to the "geographic point of view." Not surprisingly, he found that "the geography textbooks at both grade levels consistently placed significantly greater emphasis upon the factors identifying the geographic point of view" (abstract). Specifically, geography texts placed greater emphasis on the integration of maps with textual material, the use of questions based on maps, the use of maps, the use of pictures depicting contemporary conditions and situations, the use of maps stressing current data, the use of physical and/or economic maps, the integration of physical and economic maps with textual material, the use of pictures showing man-land relationships, content stressing contemporary relationships, and content organized on a regional basis stressing physical and man-land relationships. He concluded that it was important to have a separate text organized according to the geographic point of view.

One of the secondary studies compared geographic content in history and geography texts; a second examined inquiry approaches and geographic content in geography texts; and the third examined trends in content of economic geography texts over a 65-year period.

Langhans' dissertation (1961) examined the coverage of specific geographic generalizations (which were not listed in the abstract) in world history, American history, and geography texts for grades seven through 12. Forty-three texts were used in the study. It was found that world history texts did not include direct references to the generalizations, American history texts included direct references primarily to social geography generalizations, and ten of the 12 geography texts included direct references to all of the generalizations. Implied references to the generalizations were found in all texts, though most extensively in geography texts and least extensively in world history texts. Physical geography generalizations were not stressed in the world and American history texts. Questions and project suggestions in all three kinds of texts relied primarily on memorization related to location and resources. In all, the coverage of geographic generalizations in history texts was judged inadequate.

Greco (1967) found the nine high school geography texts that he examined to be of uneven quality. Among his findings were the following:

1) One of the most striking characteristics of current texts in geography was their ample use of illustrations, including full-color illustrations. However, sometimes the choice of illustrations seemed to have little to do with the content under discussion.

2) The majority of the texts followed a regional organization, usually with a few introductory chapters dealing with topical concerns. Two followed a topical organization.

2) Examples of "open-structured" materials, presented sets of unconnected but connectable ideas and data in order to elicit student inquity into relations, were few. One often found, instead, a "potpourri of uncoordinated detail masquerading as a scientific explanation" (p. 258).

4) Overall, the texts reviewed contained materials supporting their authors' overall conceptual frameworks--"perhaps because texts on world geography tend to be so all-encompassing" (p. 259).

5) A number of texts presented controversial material in a vapid, antiseptic manner.

6) Six of the nine texts presented ideas of social import and a wide range of material.

7) Texts with an economic geography focus showed the least tendency to apply a multidisciplinary approach.

8) Only four of the texts were judged to be consistently accurate. Others contained ambiguities, statements that contradicted common sense, contradictions between text and graphic materials, and internal contradictions within thetext.

9) There were few instances in which students were asked to evaluate propositions in textual materials. This element of critical thinking was relegated to the end-of-chapter activities. No direction about evaluation techniques was given.

Cadugan's dissertation (1958) examined the changes in content of economic geography texts for the secondary level from 1891 through 1956. Thirty-four texts were used. He found that there was a general consensus about the common areas of content in the field; most authors presented information on topography, climate, resources, commerce, and population. The authors tended to favor the regional-commodity or **purely** regional approach to the subject. Usually there was a regional treatment of the U. S. and a commodity basis for introduction to the other nations of the world. Three definite patterns appeared. First, "economic geography has moved from an encyclopedic presentation of material to a more comprehensive but thought-provoking exposition." Second, authors have become more concerned with the quality and quantity of the teaching aids included in the texts. Finally, "the subject of economic geography has appeared to assume more responsibility for a definite contribution towards the development of the social and cultural ideals and attitudes of the American high school student." (Abstract)

Studies Analyzing Economics Content. A total of 13 studies analyzing economic content of textbooks were identified.

Of these, only three focused on the elementary level. Two of these (Davison et al. 1973 and Davis 1977) are discussed later in this segment, in conjunction with related secondary analyses. A third elementary study was done by Davison et al. (1975); at the University of Iowa. Five series of elementary social studies texts were examined. (This study follows up a 1973 study by the same group, which we were unable to locate. That study examined ten textbook series.) The 1975 report is quite thorough and detailed. In one part, the major economic concepts typically found in textbooks for the primary grades (1-4) were identified. These were: "the basic economic problem--scarcity," under which were subsumed the concepts wants, income, choice making, and opportunity cost; "economic process," under which were subsumed the concepts limited resources, production, outputs, consumption, and want satisfaction; and "common characteristics of the economic process," under which were subsumed the concepts specialization, exchange, money, and interdependence. Intermediate-grade (5-6) textbooks typically dealt with the following concepts: "economic systems," under which were subsumed the concepts tradition, command, and market; "mixed economy," under which were subsumed the concepts scarcity (wants-resource gap), role of prices, price determination, and government and the market; and "economic growth," under which were subsumed the concepts wants, resources, scarcity, choice making, and opportunity cost. In addition, some of the concepts taught at the primary level continued to be handled in grades five and six. The third part of the report dealt with teaching strategies, which were defined to include three areas of analysis: objectives, suggested activities, and evaluation methods. Although weaknesses were identified in all three areas, evaluation methods were provided for least well in the texts. Overall findings included the following:

1) More economic content was included in the five series examined, published between 1971 and 1974, than was covered in the typical social studies text series published before the mid-1960s.

2) The extent and quality of treatment, however, did not compare favorably with some of the series examined in the first report (the report we were able to locate). Earlier texts gave better treatment of basic concepts (scarcity, choice making, and opportunity cost) that were omitted or inadequately developed in the newer books.

3) Some teacher's guides of the newer books gave less guidance on what economic concepts would be covered. Other teacher's guides identified concepts but attempted to treat them in a geographical or historical setting, which "generally results in a presentation which is at best fragmented and disjointed" (p. 31). The "integrative" (earlier called "fused") approach of these texts did not appear to allow for adequate systematic development of economic concepts.

4) There was a tendency to label concepts as economic but treat them in a conventional manner; hence, the focus was often on concepts or dimensions that economists would consider trivial.

5) Authors did not define terms carefully, ignored important dimensions of concepts, and rarely developed relationships among concepts.

6) More economic content, treated in a more systematic manner, was included in texts for grades one and two than texts for grades three and above. There seemed to be no conscientious effort to use the concepts introduced in the early grades as building blocks on which material in later grades was based. Topics covered in the upper grades, such as economic growth, were not dealt with in a framework of scarcity (wants-resource gap).

The ten studies dealing with secondary-level materials covered more than a decade, from 1963 to 1977; and several of the later studies built on the seminal effort by AEA in 1963, thus providing solid trend data.

In 1963, the Special Textbook Study Committee of the Committee on Economic Education of the AEA published its report on an examination of the economic content in high school social studies texts. Twenty-four texts were examined, eight each in the three course areas of economics, social problems, and U. S. history. Four in each area were ranked by publishers as the leaders in sales volume for the course and four others were selected without regard to sales. The task of reviewing the books was divided among the 13 economists on the committee. The general evaluative criteria they used were:

1) The principal objective of high school education in economics should be good citizenship, not the preparation of students for a college major in economics.

2) Economics is a social science and emphasis should be placed on the interdependence of decision-makers and the operation of economic systems, not on the solution of problems of the individual.

3) The economic understanding sought should concern vital matters, not trivia; and the coverate of these should be balanced, including (as examples) macro- and microeconomics, the generation of change in a system as well as its static operation, and international as well as domestic problems.

4) The approach to economic matters should be essentially analytical, though larded heavily with factual and descriptive material on economic institutions and their development.

5) The nature of value judgments should be explained; whenever relevant they should be identified; and the role they play in shaping economic systems, pllicies, and controversies should be clearly stated. Controversial issues should not be avoided, but used to stimulate interest and to distinguish between facts, value judgments, and impartial analysis as these apply to vital matters.

6) Factual and analytical errors should be kept to a minimum.

(p. vii)

Overall, the committee concluded that "the high school students whose knowledge of economics has been acquired through courses circumscribed by the textbooks principally used in . . . social studies courses would be quite unprepared to cope understandingly with most problems of economic public policy" (p. ix). Their general conclusions may be summarized as follows:

1) Most texts were oriented around the individual. Much space was devoted to "how-to-do-it" consumer education. There was often little space left for society. "How an economic system operates is seldom a topic for analysis; the sensitivity of markets and the role of prices, profits, and wages in the allocation of resources are only occasionally paid even lip service; and where economics topics are considered, the emphasis is frequently on how they affect 'you'" (p. ix). Emphasis on the individual was particularly characteristic of the texts written specifically for economics courses and was least characteristic of U.S. history texts.

2) Among the significant topics omitted were the aggregative or macro approach; determinants of economic growth and policies designed to promote it; fiscal policy; role of the Federal Reserve System; policies related to employment, growth, and stability; economic functions and consequences of federal, state, and local governments; effects of taxation and expenditures on resource allocation; unemployment, and income distribution and the institutional framework in which such decisions are made; technological change; product differentiation and nonprice competition; productivity; welfare; economic role of flexible relative prices; and comparative advantage and comparative economic systems. Ommission of some other topics, such as marginal analysis, theory of the firm, and theory of demand, was probably appropriate for high school texts. However, unwarranted weight was given to other topics of less significance, such as consumer economics and cooperatives, conservation, social security, and housing.

3) Routine description dominated analysis. High school graduates should know some basic factual materials, "but it is at least doubtful whether they should be induced to memorize details about the routine operation of banks, miles of track, specific provisions of currency legislation and tariff acts, provision for slum clearance, and qualifications for membership on the National Labor Relations Board" (p. x-xi). The "what" was given in detail while the "why" was ignored.

4) Value judgments were seldom identified or examined. Controversies were seldom analyzed. In dealing with policy matters, there was little effort to distinguish among facts, analytic conclusions, and value judgments.

5) Presentations were marred by some factual and analytical errors. All texts contained errors of fact, but not to the point of distortion. Analytical errors, including introduction of unsupported conclusions and superficial analysis, were more serious problems.

6) The texts did contain some redeeming features. The treatment of some aspects of economics, such as the role of international trade, the farm problem, big business, and labor problems, was acceptable.

Tullock and Johnson (1966) examined nine of the economics textbooks previously reviewed by the AEA Task Force. They concluded that the new editions were not significant improvments over the earlier versions, though some changes had been made. Macro-analysis was not as well developed in these texts as was micro analysis. The inclusion of consumer economics in the books reduced the amount of time and space that could be devoted to teaching economic theory and analysis. (Reported in Metcalf and Rader 1967)

Metcalf and Rader (1967) reviewed three economics texts for high school to determine if there had been any improvement since the American Economic Association's Task Force report on economics texts in the early sixties. The 66 concepts used by the Task Force guided Metcalf and Rader's examination. They found that nearly all the concepts and major institutions were dealt with in the three texts, indicating a marked improvement over the Task Force study. Two important concepts from the AEA study, however, were not discussed in the three books: the equation of exchange (MV=PQ) and opportunity cost. A third concept, not listed as basic by the Task Force, but considered so in another study, was comparative advantage; this concept was discussed only briefly in the texts, if at all. The emphasis on analysis had increased, although descriptive chapters still remained in all texts. One major "stumbling block to improvment" was the continued inclusion of consumer economics material. Also, most texts continued to include a chapter on the forms and functions of business (owning a business and the like). The texts rarely encouraged student inquiry and none took advantage of the growing number of paperback books relevant to economics.

In 1969, Tarter, in a dissertation, analyzed American history textbooks for senior high in terms of the content they contained that could be used to teach basic economic principles and institutions. He derived three conclusions from his study:

1) that all the eight texts analyzed had a "multiplicity of passages that could be used to teach about all facets of the basic economic institutions and principles" (abstract of dissertation);

2) that certain texts tended consistently to provide a relatively strong content base for teaching basic economics, while others were consistently weak in this area relative to the other texts; and

3) that some areas of content important to a program in economic education were only weakly covered, or not at all.

Alexander's lively 1969 article on the "gray flannel cover" worn by American history texts devoted substantial attention to the treatment of social science content, particularly political science and economics. (Alexander did not give information on the numbers and grade levels of the texts he reviewed.) First, he noted the lack of awareness of up-to-date political science content. For instance, the historian-author "dutifully . . . trots out of his scholarly stable his faithful old nags, 'initiative,' 'referendum,' and 'recall,' without once asking himself if they ever place or show in today's political races!" (p. 304) "Checks and balances" had become virtually a "catechismal section" in every history book. Discussions of civil liberties were "marred by omissions, uncritical narrative accounts, and that favorite device of textbook authors, balancing" (p. 304). The treatment of economics was even worse. The "theme of economic growth nowhere appears as a persistent strand in United States history" (p. 305). Tariffs were given a strictly political interpretation rather than examined in the light of the concept of comparative advantage. Detailed accounts of farm legislation might better be replaced by simple explanations of inelastic demand and increasing supply. In dealing with depressions and recessions, "the tail of the stock market is still frequently mistakenly assumed to wag the economy's dog" (p. 305). In all, according to Alexander, the authors of recent American history texts had "not successfully wrestled with the problems of controversy, selection, depth of treatment, and interpretation" (p. 305).

Townshend-Zellner's 1970 article examined whether current economics texts had improved in the decade since the American Economic Association's study.

Twelve high school texts, considered reasonably comparable to the economics texts in the AEA study, were used. All had post-1963 publication dates. The criteria employed in the AEA study were also used in this study. Townshend-Zehlner found that, as a group, there was substantial improvement over the 1959-60 texts in the case of every criterion. Over half of the current texts were judged adequate in nine of the ten criteria; on the tenth criterion (appropriate degree of emphasis on analysis relative to description), the investigator felt that all 12 texts met the standard of at least marginal adequacy. The table at the top of the next page shows the results. A "significant bimodal distribution unfolded when individual texts were considered," however (p. 65): Six of the current texts were evaluated as inadequate in most of the criteria. As a group, these texts resembled the attributes of the 1959-60 generation; all six had chronological roots going back to that period and their authors appeared still to accept the model from that period, even though they cited the 1961 AEA National Task Force Report as a standard. Almost all the improvements in current texts were concentrated in the six remaining books. Three of these met all ten of the criteria adequately; one met nine; one met eight; and one met seven. In all, five of these were acceptable and one, marginally unacceptable. The authors of these "second-generation" texts had rejected the earlier model and instead had adapted the current state-of-the-art in college text writing to the precollege level. Also, each was first published in 1967 or later. "In short, a quiet revolution in the high school texts has taken place in the past decade. It is now possible--as it was not ten years age--to recommend to high schools a significant number of texts--five in our sample of twelve--which substantially meet the minimum criteria set by the canons of our professional discipline." (p. 66) Townshend-Zellner went on to offer a hypothesis regarding the quiet revolution's causes; and, while cheering the improvement, he pointed out that the college model of economics texts also had some drawbacks, such as being

Table 24

Evaluation of Twelve Current High School Economics Texts on the Basis of Criteria and Evidence Used in the AEA Textbook Report

	Criteria	Evaluation	
		Adequate	Inadequate
A.	Coverage		
A-1.	Treatment of aggregative economics and the problems of instability	6	6
A-2.	Role of government	6	6
A-3.	Treatment of growth and change	5	7
A-4.	Treatment of the insatiability of human wants and the scarcity of resources to satisfy them	8	4
A-5.	Treatment of economics as a social science omitting emphasis on the solution of problems of the individual (as consumer or producer)	6	6
A-6.	Avoidance of disproportionate attention to individual topics	7	5
B.	Role of analysis vs. description	12*	0
C.	Quality and competence of analysis	6	6
D.	Concern with system-orientation and system-content	6	6
E.	Value judgments and controversy	5	7

*Subject to the disclaimer that *emphasis* on analysis does not imply *adequate* analysis.

(Townshend-Zellner 1970, p. 65)

understandable only to above-average students and reflecting a monolithic sameness from one text to the next.

Laner's dissertation (1973) criticized earlier studies of economics content in texts for not employing a controlled method of content analysis and undertook to use such a method. He analyzed eight high school economics texts using four economic content categories: political-economic (primarily citizen education, emphasizing "should do" content); principles (based on logical analysis and/or use of symbols for explaining underlying theory of economic concepts); institutional (describing the institutions of society); and consumer (personal information of a "how-to-to-it" nature). He found that one text included content from only two of the categories and four from only three categories. The percentage of content in each of these areas accumulated for all texts was as follows: institutional, 88.86 percent; principles, 9.29 percent; consumer, 1.10 percent; and political-economic, 0.75 percent. The analyst concluded that secondary economics texts were significantly lacking in content other than the factual, descriptive, nonanalytical type.

In the summer of 1971, the Joint Council of Economic Education (JCEE) began an extensive analysis and evaluation of the treatment of economics in elementary and secondary textbooks. This project was explicitly designed as a follow-up to the earlier AEA project. The report of the JCEE effort was published in 1972 and 1973. It consisted of five monographs. Three were focused on economics in social studies materials at each of three grade levels (1-6, 7-9, and 10-12); one focused on economics in 11th- and 12th-grade history texts, and one examined economics in audiovisual teaching materials. The first four are described below. The last, since it dealt with supplementary materials instead of texts, is not examined here. (For those who are interested, the reference for the latter is Audiovisual Materials for Teaching Economics by Signey J. Kronish, New York: JCEE, 1972.)

Overall, the JCEE's committee and staff members who worked on the project judged that "the social studies textual materials of today are vastly superior to those of ten or fifteen years ago. Most authors and publishers have done a superb job in making their materials more interesting, attractive, relevant, scholarly and in tune with the newer teaching strategies." (p. 4, all four volumes)

The first of the JCEE reports (Davison, Kilgore, and Sgontz 1973) looked at elementary (1-6) social studies texts. The review committee concentrated on textbook series published in 1968 or later. Ten series, which were found to be most widely used in a survey of school systems, were analyzed. The materials were examined to determine which of a specified set of economic ideas and concepts were dealt with and in what manner they were dealt with. The elementary committee "generally had high praise for authors and publishers. They found 'increased coverage and more systematic treatment of economic content in new textbook series'." (p. 16). Primary-grade materials (1-3) developed economic concepts more adequately than did intermediate grade materials (4-6), although there were still some weaknesses, such as in the development of relationships between key concepts. Intermediate texts did not treat the market system adequately; there was some misuse of technical concepts; there were some inadequate or inaccurate definitions and errors of analysis; and sometimes they lacked well-developed economic models. Overall, the committee suggested greater attention be given to sequential development of economic concepts from the lower to higher grades.

The junior high study (Watson, Askari, Campbell, Milliken, and Ounjian 1973) followed the same analysis procedures as the elementary study, but did not survey schools to determine the extent of use of the 39 books examined, all of which were published in 1968 or after. The committee found that the junior high texts were generally superior to those of the past. However, they were still found to be inadequate: "most junior high school students will not attain a satisfactory level of economic understanding from the social studies materials available to them." (p. 16) The material presented was largely factual; student analytical abilities would not be encouraged by the materials. As with the elementary materials, concepts were not developed sequentially and the texts failed to define basic concepts adequately.

The high school committee examined government, problems of democracy, geography, sociology, and anthropology texts found to be widely used in a survey of four of the most populous states and selected other innovative materials not so widely used. All 27 books or series had publication dates of 1968 or later. Analytical procedures were the same as for the elementary and junior high texts. The report (Weidenaar, Harrington, Horton, and Shermis 1973) noted that the committee found some improvement in the newer materials over earlier materials, but that, overall, the tests were "unlikely to assist a student either to identify an economic problem or to use economic analytical processes." (p. 17) Although basic economic concepts were found in all subject areas, economics was more notable for its absence than presence in these texts. There were too many assertions without support; too many inadequate explanations of economic terms; too many failures to distinguish between fact and opinion; and too little analysis. Most of the mateirals did not treat economics systematically and there were many errors--factual misinformation, out-of-date information, and improper application of economic concepts. Some texts were given praise, however, for virtues in format, case studies, and teaching strategies.

The report on high school history textbooks (O'Neill 1973) concluded that history materials had come a long way in the previous few years in attempting to include more economics. Passive narratives were being replaced by exercises with greater student participation. However, there was little analytical structure in the economics that was included. A few authors, with less than optimal success, had attempted to provide "a conceptual framework to allow students to practice the use of the analytical tools of the economist" (p. 17). In all, though economics was finally being recognized as important in U.S. and world history books, coverage was superficial and sometimes confusing. The history text committee used the same analytical procedures as the other committees. One of the texts examined had a pre-1967 publication date, but was still being Not surprisingly, over two-thirds of the materials sets were designed for the senior high level, the level at which economics had traditionally been taught. The treatment of economics content was found to be adequate in 15 of the 18 cases (although many of the materials did not attempt to cover a large number of aspects of the discipline, since they were supplementary). Of those materials judged adequate, however, too many stressed "trivial description" too heavily. Only two sets of materials attempted to have students "examine the assumptions of the U.S. economic system and share their own beliefs and attitudes about the goals of the American economy" (p. 172). Only eight of the sets were pedagogically adequate and most of these were at the elementary level. Most of the materials invited the "LR3 teaching strategy": lecture, read, recite, regurgitate. Only five of the sets showed evidence of having been fieldtested. Summarizing his analysis of all three categories of materials, Davis concluded that (1) the AEA National Task Force Report of 1963 had had a significant impact on the development of precollege economics materials; (2) there were relatively more materials available for teaching economics at the senior high level than at other precollege levels; (3) at all levels, treatment of economic concepts and generalizations was inadequate; (4) with a few exceptions, economics teaching resources for the precollege level were "unexciting, unimaginative, and uncreative in teaching/learning configurations"; (5) the treatment of economics had improved considerably since the AEA report; (6) there was some confusion as to the appropriate level for using many precollege economics materials; and (7) there was a lack of treatment of seven specific content/problem areas (U.S. income distribution patterns; third world economies; role of regulatory agencies; policy issues related to inflation and unemployment; assumptions and values underlying U.S. economic system; economic power of labor unions, large firms, conglomerates, and multinationals; other economic systems and ways of thinking about resource allocation; and power or lack of power of the individual operating in the economy). extensively used in school districts; the others had publication dates of 1968 or later. Nine world history books and ten U.S. history books were selected out of a total of 62 possible texts.

Finally, the most recent analysis of economics materials was done by Davis (1977). Davis examined audiovisual materials, games and simulations, and print materials. We shall report only the conclusions in regard to the latter category here. Eighteen commercially published sets of curriculum materials were examined, five of which were published between 1966 and 1971, two in 1973, seven in 1974, three in 1975, and one in 1976. Some of the materials in the print category were supplmementary rather than core texts, however, Davis' conclusions for those cannot be separated out from conclusions in regard to texts. Davis used analytic criteria similar to those employed by the NCEE committees in 1971-72. In general, his concern was for the adequacy of treatment of economic content, although he was less concerned about full coverage than was JCEE, since some materials were only of a supplementary nature. In addition, Davis was interested in quality of pedagogy employed. The table below summarizes his findings:

Table 25

Davis Assessment of 18 Sets of Economics Curriculum Materials by Grade Level Cluster

Criteria	Grade Level Cluster 4 - 6		7 - 9		10 - 12	
	A*	I**	A	I	A	I
Treatment of Economics Content - systematic, analytical, accurate, understandable	4	0	3	0	8	3
Pedagogical Considerations - existence of author rational, instructional objectives, instructional theory and teaching strategies, assessment plans	3	1	2	1	3	8
Evidence of Materials Field Test	2	2	1	2	2	9

*Adequate to meet criteria (A)
**Inadequate to meet criteria (I)

(Davis 1977, p. 172)

Studies Analyzing Political Science Content. Of the nine studies dealing with political science content and methods in texts, four fall within the period since 1970. Another four fall within the 1965-69 period and the date of another is not known, although it is probably in either the 1965-69 or the 1970+ period. (The reference to the latter study did not give the date and neither a copy of the abstract nor a copy of the thesis itself could be obtained.) No studies on political science content could be found prior to 1966. Five studies dealt with the secondary level only; two dealt with both elementary and secondary; one, with elementary only; and for one study (Alexander 1969) the grade levels are not known.

The earliest study, a dissertation by Smith (1966), examined 33 high school civics, government, and problems of democracy tests. Smith identified five modes of inquiry characteristic of the discipline of political science: historical, normative, analytical, scientific, and behavioral. He found that there was no evidence that the authors of textbooks were concerned with the modes of inquiry of the political scientist. However, a teacher who recognized these modes could find material for instruction about these modes, since the textbooks did contain unidentified examples of the five modes. More recent texts showed a growing awareness of political science as a discipline and recognition of a general problem-solving mode of inquiry, though not a disciplinary one, such as that of political science. Smith noted a trend in these texts toward placing less emphasis on personal adjustment and more on the discipline's interests.

Smith and Patrick (1967) examined 12 junior high civics texts and found that there were two basic types. The first type concentrated mainly on the theory of democracy and the form and functioning of politics at the local, state, and national levels. The material in this type was drawn almost entirely from the academic discipline of "government." The second type gave less attention to the form and operation of government and concentrated instead on the way in which governmental institutions related to society at large. Though the academic discipline of government was still central, these texts drew heavily on history, sociology, economics, and psychology as well. Criticisms of the 12 texts as a whole were as follows:

1) They did not effectively integrate disparate course content. They were organized around points of interest rather than around basic social science concepts and principles that could tie the material together.

2) They "fail to represent America as it really is." (p. 109) They perpetuated misconceptions because they avoided or glossed over subjects and misused or omitted important social science concepts

that could illuminate the subject. Their coverage of racial problems, for instance, was quite inadequate and they failed to mention important social science concepts, such as status, role, and mores, that could help account for differences in political behavior.

3) They inculcated values through moralizing. Shallow treatment was accorded to controversial subjects and "preachments preclude[d] the formulation of normative judgments based on careful appraisal of prevailing conditions and anticipated consequences" (p. 115). They prescribed values rather than examined them.

4) They did not help students develop inquiry skills. They failed to provide sufficient guidance about the procedures for conducting inquiry and did not require persistent, precise practice of such skills.

Massialas (1967) analyzed six high school texts in American government. His findings included the following:

1) American government texts made no effort to define the field of study or employ a conceptual or theoretical framework as organizer. As a result, they displayed uncertainty about the reasons for studying government.

2) They displayed strong ethnocentric tendencies and gave an unrealistic picture of the American political system, including the following elements: the government was seen as actually operating on the consent-of-the-governed principle; America was touted as the best country to live in; American citizens were seen as the most rational voters; the American form of government was billed as the best and most appropriate for all societies; and since America was the most powerful and most democratic state, it should be the world's keeper.

3) They did not deal ethically or responsibly with controversial issues. Highly controversial issues were excluded; controversial issues that were discussed were presented in an antiseptic manner, and, in spite of exhortations to think critically, no models or procedures for doing so were given.

4) Problem solving and critical inquiry were not encouraged. For instance, the texts did not suggest that interpretations of social phenomena other than those they presented were possible.

5) They overemphasized historical development and legal structure and underemphasized behavioral and socioeconomic factors that affect political decision making.

6) Little attention was given to foreign countries, except for passages attacking ideologies competing with that of the U.S.

Alexander's picturesque article (1969) on the "gray flannel cover" focused in part on political science content of American history texts. His findings were summarized in the previous section.

Gillespie examined five high school government texts in an article published in 1975. The texts were examined in terms of four types of political concepts (political institutions, political philosophy, political behavior, and systematic behavior); eleven political inquiry skills; and three types of instructional methodology (expository, discovery, and inquiry). Each program was rated under the above categories according to two criteria: inclusiveness (referring to the systematic coverage of each of the dimensions of the analytical category) and continuity (the number of times the ideas or skills were presented throughout the program, allowing for reinforcement and extension). Overall, Gillespie concluded that most texts did try to organize material around themes or conceptual frameworks, but they did so sporadically. Values issues and data from recent social science research has been included in most texts and realism had made some gains over idealism. However, the texts were a long way from treating adequately most political science concepts and methods. Students were asked to analyze, generalize, hypothesize, question, and evaluate without being given explicit instruction in how these things are done. The texts provided considerable information about political institutions, but there was little guidance in integrating this information and putting it to use. Students could find out very little from these texts about political behavior at any level of government. Also, there was little material on the dynamics of systemic behavior and the relevance of other information to systemic states. The greatest need was for texts to provide opportunities for students to use scientific modes of inquiry, applying them to the information conveyed in the texts.

Adelson and Crosby (1971) analyzed nine "new social studies" curriculum packages for use in civics and government courses. The purpose of their book was to provide "vital statistics" on these packages in such a way that school personnel could make relatively rapid selections of materials for tryout and use in schools. Information provided for each package included publisher, grade level, format, suggested length of use, instructional strategies, readability, teacher training requirements, characteristics of teacher's guide, provision of student tests, cost, and availability. The analysis of political science content was minimal. Content information provided included the overall perspective (e.g., public issues, social problems, political systems, political behavior, law, institutions, history) and lists of sample topics dealt with in the packages. No generalizations in regard to political science content across materials packages were made.

Turner's handbook (1971) was also designed to provide information for textbook selection, but for the full range, K-12, of "new social studies" materials and including materials other than those designed mainly for political education. Like the Adelson-Crosby volume, Turner provided information on many aspects of the materials besides content; however, unlike the Adelson-Crosby volume, Turner gave more detailed attention to political science content. Each package was classified by area of political science (political theory, public law, international relations, comparative government, American political behavior--national, American political behavior--local); by concepts covered (legitimacy; authority; power; decision-making; leadership; citizenship, including representation, voting, socialization, interest groups, participation, and parties; human rights, including freedom, equality, natural rights, conscience, justice, and duty; change, including development, modernization, and stability; conflict, including pressure, violence, resolution, and revolution; institutions; bureaucracy; sovereignity; and law); and by issues (civil rights, violence; right to dissent; political security; social security; quality of life, including pollution, over-population, and poverty and welfare; international peace and law; and drug use and abuse). Turner reported that, of the 49 packages examined, 14 were organized using concepts from more than one discipline; 20 were organized according to a discipline structure other than that of political science; four were organized following an area studies pattern; and 11 were organized around a primarily political science orientation. Eight of the 42 projects that produced the 49 packages were preparing materials for the entire K-12 or 1-12 social studies curriculum; ten of the projects had produced elementary materials; and 33 had produced secondary materials. Turner noted that constitutional law and related topics had received fairly good coverage, but only minimal treatment was given to political theory and the history of political thought. Some materials on comparative study of governments had been prepared; international relations was given quite limited attention. Very few materials designed to encourage better minority self-concepts, cultural identity, and pride were available.

The American Political Science Association's Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education (1971) pulled together findings of a number of studies of materials and classroom practices and also conducted some surveys and analyses of its own. The findings in regard to materials for political science instruction were as follows:

1) Much of the available textbook material transmitted a "naive, unrealistic and romanticized image of political life which confuses the ideals of deomcracy with the realities of politics" (p. 437). Both elementary and secondary materials showed this deficiency. For example, the treatment of class and race in elementary texts had been found to lack realism in the extreme; Goldstein's study (undated) found "no awareness that some pupils and some Americans are poor . . . and that the poor are objects of serious prejudices . . ." (p. 437). In secondary texts, there was a tendency to confuse what ought to be (consent of the governed, for instance) with what actually existed (something less than full consent of the governed).

2) Texts placed "undue stress upon historical events, legal structures and formal institutional aspects of government and fail[ed] to transmit adequate knowledge about political behaviors and processes" (p. 439). The majority of materials then in use at all grade levels either ignored or inadequately treated such traditionally important concepts as freedom, sovereignty, consensus, authority, class, compromise, and power as well as newer concepts such as role, socialization, culture, system, decision making, and the like.

3) Materials reflected "an ethnocentric proccupation with American society and fail[ed] to transmit to students an adequate knowledge about the political systems of other national societies or the international system" (p. 440). Third-world nations as well as communist nations were generally treated rather harshly and inaccurately.

4) Textbooks did not "develop within students a capacity to think about political phenomena in conceptually sophisticated ways; an understanding of, and skill in the process of, social scientific inquiry; or a capacity to systematically analyze political decisions and values" (p. 442). At the elementary level, the textbook in social studies was expected to reinforce the reading curriculum and not interfere with it by introducing subject matter with difficult ideas; also, elementary texts were locked into an "expanding horizons" approach to social studies and this, too, militated against the practice of critical inquiry, since the approach used primarily descriptive presentation. At the secondary level, virtually no texts were organized to engage students in abstract, complex mental operations; instead, they were based on the premise that students must first absorb an encyclopedic amount of information before they can think critically, and, further, they emphasized prescription of "correct" values.

5) Materials "fail[ed] to develop within students an understanding of the capacities and skills needed to participate effectively and democratically in politics" (p. 443). Much of what passed for citizenship training was an attempt to teach regard for the rules and standards of conduct of the school. Texts emphasized voting as the means by which citizens could most effectively influence the political system, excluding other means of participation in the society's life.

The APSA committee's report was the most strongly worded indictment of the condition of materials of any found in the content analysis literature.

Studies Analyzing Anthropology Content. Five studies (three by the same person) were found to deal with anthropological content. The three by the same person dealt with the full range of grade levels, K-12, and were all done within the most recent period. Since 1970; one of the other studies was conducted in 1964 and focused on the elementary level; the fifth study was conducted in the early sixties (probably 1963) and focused on the senior high level.

The 1964 study was a dissertation by Awkard. He examined 30 fifth- and sixth-grade social studies textbooks to determine the relative amounts and kinds of concepts from cultural anthropology, sociology, and psychology presented in the sample. The sample included fused social studies books, history books, and geography books in order to compare their treatments of the behavioral science subject matter. A total of 350 concepts were identified for use in the study. Less than six percent of each book of the 30-book sample dealt with the concepts, a percentage judged negligible by the researcher. There were six ideas in fused books for every three ideas in history books and every one idea accounted for approximately 49 percent of the total yield. The remaining 51 percent was distributed among 167 topics with roughly half of these receiving no presentation. Only nine of the 171 concept presentations were pointedly described. The remaining 162 were recognizably implied. There were roughly four anthropological paragraphs per 1,000 paragraphs, two sociological paragraphs per 1,000, and one psychological paragraph per 1,740 in the sample of books. Awkard concluded that existing social studies texts did not incorporate ideas from the behavioral sciences to any appreciable extent.

Sady (1963) analyzed five secondary world history texts for their treatment of the culture concept and ethnocentrism. Eight other world history texts were surveyed but not analyzed in detail. The analysis was conducted under the auspices of the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project of the American Anthropological Association (funded by NSF). The survey indicated that some use was being made of anthropology's central concept, culture, in world history materials but that the concept was sometimes misunderstood. Analysis of the five texts showed that the definitions of culture given in texts often do not correspond with the further use of the word in the texts. Also, attempts to describe non-Western cultures, the motivations of persons in those cultures, and the life often do so in terms of Western values and behavior patterns only. Most of the texts have a narrow view of world history and take an overly indulgent view of certain aspects of Western history--in other words, are ethnocentric.

Dynneson's three studies (1972, 1975a, 1975b) are sufficiently similar to be dealt with together. Dynneson analyzed 21 curriculum packages associated with the "new social studies" (including not only texts and more complex packages for full courses, but also simulations and supplementary materials). All had been identified as containing substantial anthropological content. The dissertation included extensive analyses of six sets of project materials, using the SSEC's Curriculum Materials Analysis System, while the paper and book contained shorter summaries of these analyses, as well as summaries of analyses of commercial texts, simulations, and supplementary materials. Dynneson concluded that there were too few anthropological materials at almost all levels; there were no anthropological simulations for grades K-3; the intermediate grades (4-6) were quite well supplied with anthropological materials; junior high (7-9) needed more materials; texts were needed at the high school level; teachers needed more training in anthropology; and there was a need to integrate anthropology into the rest of the social studies.

Studies Analyzing Sociology Content. Only three studies analyzing sociological content were found. One was Akward (1964), described in the previous section (Anthropology). The second was Girault (1967). She examined two psychology and two sociology textbooks for the high school level. She concluded that the texts fell short of meeting three basic objectives.

1) The materials did not contribute to making the student conversant with how psychologists and sociologists think. They underemphasized the dynamic nature of knowledge in the social sciences and the tentativeness of conclusions, and they violated the spirit of inquiry through their didactic presentation of the content. They offered only minimal exposition of social science methodologies.

2) The texts also failed to make students aware of how an individual in our society relates to and uses the social sciences, that is, how one can assume the role of a consumer of social science knowledge. Virtually ignored were skills in identifying problems and information sources, assessing reliability of sources, and determining relevance of information to particular problems. The mishandling of controversial issues was particularly serious in this context. The approach to issues such as sex, religion, drugs, and social class completely misrepresented the social science perspective.

3) The texts came closest to realizing the third objective, understanding of oneself and one's social miieu. However, the prescriptive, lecturing tone was troublesome here as elsewhere.

The third analysis of sociology content and methods in social studies materials was done by Hering (1966) under the auspices of the Sociological Association (funded by NSF). Hering analyzed the five sociology texts then used in high school sociology courses. He examined the objectives and emphases of the texts, their coverage of 15 sociological topics, the writing style and attitudes of authors, use of the literature in the discipline as distinguished from popular sources, attention to other cutlures and societies, treatment of sociological methodology, presentation of proposed solutions to social problems, and devices for stimulating student interest. Overall, Hering found that the texts tend to emphasize a "life adjustment" approach rather than the academic approach typical of college-level sociology texts. The life-adjustment orientation generally entailed coverage of topics beyond those that would be dealt with in a discipline approach and omission of some important areas of sociological research. Social problems generally were treated as something detached from the students, possibly leading students to "attach less significance to these problems than they might if mroe realistic information were available."

Studies Analyzing Psychology Content. As with sociology, only three studies focusing on psychology content were located. Awkard (1964) was described in the Anthropology section above, and Girault (1967) was described in the Sociology section above.

The American Psychological Association published The Psychology Teacher's Resource Book: First Course in 1973. This included reviews of introductory psychology texts, reading books, laboratory manuals, periodicals, popular books (such as novels, case studies, and biographies), audiovisual materials, and reference materials. Also included were chapters on equipment, animals, and supplies; national organizations; ways of increasing student involvement;

and ways of organizing instruction in psychology. The section containing reviews of texts is relevant here. A total of 51 texts for introductory courses in psychology at the high school and college level were reviewed. The reviews are brief--a few paragraphs long--and contain both descriptive and judgmental information. Unfortunately, no overall conclusions are made on the basis of these reviews.

Summary Observations

1) With 161 studies identified, one cannot say there is any lack overall, of content analyses of social studies materials, although this body of research might be criticized for not attending to specific areas of content sufficiently or in the most helpful manner.

2) Of the 161 content analyses, 67 (42 percent) were doctoral dissertations or master's theses.

3) Seventy of the studies dealt with elementary materials; 50 with junior high materials; 79 with senior high materials; and 26 did not identify the level of materials.

4) Eleven categories of topics were analyzed. The most-analyzed areas were (a) the treatment of social science content and methods in social studies materials; (b) the treatment of specific concepts or themes (e.g., communism, values, violence, social change, quantitative data) in social studies materials; and (c) the treatment of minorities in social studies materials. Other categories of analysis were treatment of history content and methods; treatment of epistemology and learning theory; treatment of unspecified or general social studies content; treatment of foreign areas; objectives; illustrations and media; and readibility. Some studies analyzed multiple aspects of materials, without focusing primarily on one. The abstract of one study was unclear as to the aspect analyzed.

5) Very little in the way of trends over time can be discerned. There has been an overall increase in analytic activity (the number of studies done within each five-year period). This period-by-period increase holds true for two of the three most-analyzed categories, treatment of specific concepts and themes and treatment of minorities. However, it does not hold true for analysis of social science content and methods; in that category, analysis activity seems to have peaked in 1965-69 and declined sharply after that. These two categories were central ones in the "new social studies" and may reflect the rise and decline of that movement to some degree.

6) Analyses of multiple aspects of social studies curriculum materials, not highlighting any one dimension in particular, have appeared only since 1970. Unlike the analyses of the previous periods (which sought to generalize across a number of materials in regard to a few

selected aspects of those materials), these multiple-aspect analyses have been designed as materials selection aids for use by school district personnel. Consequently, instead of generalizing, they aim to discriminate among materials, showing the points at which each package differs from others.

7) Within the social science category, there have been five studies analyzing anthropological content and methods in materials; 13 analyzing economics; five analyzing geography, nine analyzing political science, three analyzing psychology; three analyzing sociology; and seven dealing with general social science. Obviously, the three so-called behavioral sciences (psychology, sociology, and anthropology) have received the least attention. (Three of the five anthropology analyses were done by the same person and based largely on a single piece of research.)

8) Almost without exception, analyses of social science content and methods in materials (as well as analyses of other kinds of content) report inadequacies in treatment by textbooks. The few studies that do report positive findings are almost all trend studies; that is, they have compared recent materials to earlier materials and have found some improvements. The two most notable instances of such optimistic findings are in economics and in the treatment of blacks (though not other minorities). However, not all trend studies have found improvement (for instance, a certain amount of backsliding has been found in the case of the treatment of women in curriculum materials).

9) As one would expect, most studies report there are substantial variations in quality and amount of treatment of social science content and methods from one text to the next.

10) Although one must not be too quick to generalize from the disparate studies of social science treatment in materials, the following tentative conclusions are suggested:

   a) The seven studies analyzing social science content and methods in general (not focusing on any particular discipline) suggest that, at both the elementary and secondary level, historical content, concepts, and organizers dominate heavily. Among the social sciences, the most adequately treated at the elementary level are geography and anthropology; at the secondary level, political science and economics. Social science methods are not treated adequately at any level.

   b) To no one's surprise, studies comparing the treatment of geography content and methods in geography texts versus history and fused social studies texts found that the geography texts gave more adequate treatment to the "geographic point of view." One study that focused solely on geography texts, however, was critical of some aspects of all but a few of the texts. A major complaint was the failure of the texts to encourage critical thinking. A major compliment was their ample, and usually appropriate, use of illustrations.

   c) Three studies were found on the treatment of economics at the elementary level. One found that, although there had been an increase in the amount of economics covered in elementary texts over the last decade, the quality of treatment had declined, particularly in respect to basic concepts (scarcity, choice making, and opportunity cost). The other two generally found improvements in elementary treatments of economics, although inadequacies still existed.

d) The treatment of economics at the secondary level has been analyzed quite thoroughly, due primarily to the American Economics Association's support of this kind of inquiry in the early sixties and the Joint Council on Economic Education's subsequent support. The AEA report criticized economics texts for giving too much emphasis to the individual (particularly, devoting too much space to consumer economics) and too little to societal interests; omitting significant topics, particularly in the realm of macro-economics; containing too much description and far too little analysis; not attending to controversial issues and identifying value judgments; and containing factual and analytical errors. Several follow-up studies found marked improvement in texts developed after the AEA's report--one termed it a "quiet revolution"--although certain deficiencies, such as the continued inclusion of consumer economics at the expense of other content, still existed.

e) Analyses of political science content are of slightly later origin than those of economics, but they do give us some indication of change over time, at least at the secondary level. (No studies at the elementary level were identified.) The earlier studies, from 1966 to 1971, criticized civics, government, problems of democracy, and American history texts for failing to present political science modes of inquiry and to promote development of students' critical thinking skills; lacking integration (emphasis was on heavy doses of description, often rambling, with little or no indication of how things fit together) and selectivity (too much space was devoted to trivia); presenting an unrealistic picture of American government and politics (avoiding controversial issues and presenting the United States in an "ethnocentric" light--"we are the greatest," as one study put it); moralizing and inculcating values; and underemphasizing behavioral and socioeconomic factors, while overemphasizing historical development and legal structure. A later study (1975), which examined a new vintage of texts, found a number of improvements: they were organized by themes or concepts; values issues were dealt with frequently, and, in many cases, forthrightly; data from social science research were used; and the texts were much more realistic and less idealistic. However, they did not provide much guidance in or opportunity for application of scientific modes of inquiry; and there was little emphasis on political behavior or systemic dynamics.

f) Only minimal attention has been given to analyzing behavioral science (anthropology, psychology, and sociology) content and methods in social studies materials. These studies generally conclude that the behavioral sciences are inadequately treated in social studies materials. Beyond this, they do not provide sufficient base for generalizing.

1.5 State of Social Studies Teacher Education

This section discusses the actual academic preparation of social studies teachers in history and the social sciences, the training institution and state certification requirements in history/social sciences, some characteristics of social studies teacher educators, and inservice training practices in social studies. We have not discussed training practices and requirements in "professional education," e.g., methods course requirements and student teaching requirements, since we judged that NSF's primary interest would be in the academic side of teacher education. Readers should be cautioned, however, that variations in academic preparation of social studies teachers (or at least variations on the scale of, say, the addition of a few credit hours in one social science) may not make much difference in classroom practice and student learning. Some studies are reported in Section 2.9 (research on teacher education) that indicate that increases in subject-matter preparation alone have only marginal, if any, utility.

Sources

Although the comprehensive and special-focus reviews did not themselves yield much information describing practices in teacher education, they provided the starting point for locating the 30 specific studies as well as other material used in this section. The three compilations of dissertations and a computer search of Dissertation Abstracts from 1973 through 1975 were even more valuable in this regard. In addition to the 30 specific studies, three annual catalogues of state certification requirements and a few other miscellaneous sources were used.

Overall, there does not appear to be (or, we were not able to identify) a great deal of descriptive literature on teacher education practices. A possibly rich source that we did not tap is the literature on dissemination of innovation. That literature does contain much information on at least inservice programs. However, it was to have been covered in the Far West Laboratory's report to NSF and, hence, was felt to be beyond the boundaries of this review.

Documentation and Discussion

Actual Academic Preparation of Practicing Social Studies Teachers

Academic Preparation of Social Studies Teachers in Social Studies in General. In 1960, Pohlmann and Wellman reported on two studies (one in Illinois and the other in Kansas) of the preparation of high school social studies teachers. They noted a high percentage of social studies teachers who tended to have their major preparation in another field. Of the Kansas teacher surveyed in 1956-57, only 44.8 percent had an academic major in social science. Over one-fourth of the Illinois teachers surveyed at about the same time had majors in fields other than social science--especially in physical education.

Pohlmann and Wellman noted that high school social studies teachers lacked a broad education in the various disciplines composing the social studies. In Illinois, 11.1 percent of the social studies teachers had no college credit in political science, 21.3 percent had no work in economics, 26.6 percent had none in sociology or anthropology, 56.2 percent had no credit in geography, and (unbelievably, commented Pohlmann and Wellman) 2.3 percent had no work in American history and 9.8 percent had none in European history. Over 42 percent had had no work on Latin America, Asia, and Africa. The Kansas study revealed even less breadth of education in social science.

Pohlmann and Wellman noted that a significant proportion of high school social studies teachers failed to meet the states' minimum requirements. In Illinois, 18 percent lacked the required eight hours of American history, 36 percent did not meet the European history requirement, 41 percent did not meet the political science requirement, 66 percent the economics requirement, 68 percent the sociology requirement, and 81 percent the geography requirement.

Siemers (1960) reported that his survey of California teachers of tenth-grade world history showed 46 percent of the entire sample had majored in areas other than history or the social sciences.

Wendt (1963) found in a survey of 147 elementary homeroom teachers engaged in teaching social studies that background in social science, as well as social studies methods, was "generally limited" and that these teachers cited as a major problem "acquiring the social studies background information for teaching the units" (abstract).

Kirby (1964) studied the preparation of Colorado junior high school teachers of social studies during 1962-63. He found that "the academic preparation of a majority of teachers included a broad background in the social sciences with American history, sociology, political science, European history, and economics most often reported" (abstract).

Alilunas (1965) noted a New York study that found that at least 20 percent of those teaching social studies in New York junior and senior high schools did not have a minimum background in the social sciences.

Hillestad (1965) noted that several surveys in various regions of the U.S. had shown that many social studies teachers were not qualified by virtue of their academic preparation or state certification requirements to teach social studies; nevertheless a survey developed independently of the regional efforts by the U.S. Department of Commerce, USOE, and NEA had indicated that the supply of social studies teachers far exceeded the demand. Apparently the employment of underqualified social studies teachers could not be attributed to an inadequate supply of qualified people.

Hahn (1965) reviewed the results of a number of surveys, including some mentioned in this report, in order to determine the adequacy of political science preparation for teachers of civics and government. Based on statistics for Colorado, New Mexico, Virginia, Illinois, Michigan, Maine, Minnesota, Kentucky, Ohio, New York, Kansas, North Carolina, Texas, and Arizona (all developed in separate studies), Hahn concluded that the academic background of teachers of social studies generally and of civics and government courses specifically was quite poor--nonexistent in a large percentage of cases, in fact.

Irvin (1967) surveyed junior high school social studies teachers in the North Centry Accrediting Region during 1965-66. She found that they had undergraduate majors in social studies, history, English, speech, geography, foreign language, and general business and that they averaged 43 hours in their majors and 25 hours in their minors.

At the elementary level, Godwin noted in his 1967 dissertation that less than one-half of the teachers in his sample from Nebraska districts that did not employ a full-time elementary curriculum director had earned a Bachelor's degree in any field at all!

Anderson (1968) found that teachers in Idaho high schools teaching social studies during 1965-66 averaged 40 semester credits of training in the social sciences, but the credits tended to be concentrated in American history. The teachers were not well prepared in the broader range of social sciences.

Monson (1968) found that Utah elementary teachers had completed the greatest number of social studies hours in history, psychology, and geography; the average had completed less than 1.5 hours of course work each in anthropology, philosophy, general social science, and economics.

Miller's survey (1969) of Ohio secondary social studies teachers found that teacher preparation in the social sciences was "notably weak," with the greatest deficiencies in economics, geography, and anthropology. Nonpublic school teachers had greater weaknesses than public school teachers in economics, political science, and geography. Graduates of public teacher training institutions in Ohio had a larger number of credit hours in political science, economics, sociology, and geography than graduates of nonpublic teacher taining institutions in the state, while the nonpublic graduates had greater preparation in psychology.

Bachus (1972) found that Arkansas secondary social studies teachers were not adequately prepared in the social sciences. Social studies teachers had received more college credits in history than any other social science.

Lester (1975) surveyed Montana secondary social studies teachers who had graduated from Montana teacher training institutions before 1972 and found that they had been adequately prepared to teach history and government but not to teach anthropology, geography, economics, sociology, and social psychology. The teachers' perceptions of their academic preparation fit with the finding that Montana training institutions had required history and government courses more than other courses in social sciences. Lester's abstract does not present findings as to number of credit hours actually taken in various disciplines by the teachers, however.

Academic Preparation of Social Studies Teachers in Specific Courses Taught. Pohlmann and Wellman (1960) noted "a significant tendency to assign [social studies] teachers to classes for which they do not have specific preparation" (p. 311). More than one-fourth of the Illinois teachers surveyed did not meet the minimum state requirements in the specific courses they taught; some had no college credits at all in the courses they were teaching. More teachers of American history than other subjects met state requirements; however, nearly 13 percent of the American history teachers did not have at least 16 hours of history, including eight of American history. Twenty-two percent of the civics/government teachers were inadequately prepared; 28 percent of the geography and world history teachers did not meet state requirements; and 33 percent of the sociology and 35 percent of the economics teachers failed to meet the minimum state requirements for those courses. In the Kansas study, even fewer social studies teachers met minimum state requirements for the courses they taught. Twenty-one percent lacked the minimum required credits in American history; 34 percent in world history; 36 percent in economics; 42 percent in government; and 73 percent in geography.

Black (1963) found that, among a sample of junior and senior high social studies teachers (concentrated primarily in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina), history, geography, and civics (in that order) were the most frequently taught subjects, regardless of pattern of academic preparation. The pattern of undergraduate social science training had little bearing on initial or later teaching assignments. Few junior high teachers had adequate undergraduate training in geography, although geography was one of the most widely taught subjects at that level. The vast majority of teachers of state history had had no course work at all in state history. Black argued in favor of broad preparation in many social sciences rather than concentration in one or two, since he found that most social studies teachers would be assigned to teach up to five areas over a period of years, even though they were usually assigned initially to only one or two subjects.

Kirby (1964) surveyed junior high school social studies teachers in Colorado during 1962-63. He found that slightly more than 20 percent reported in excess of 24 semester hours of academic preparation related to their teaching assignments, while slightly more than 20 percent were assigned to teach classes for which they had fewer than five semester hours of academic preparation. As a group, geography teachers were "considerably less well prepared" for teaching geography than were history teachers for teaching history or civics teachers for teaching civics.

Irvin's study (1967) of junior high school social studies teachers in the North Central Accrediting Region found that these teachers were least well prepared to teach geography, even though that subject is most often taught at the seventh-grade level.

Anderson (1968) found that high school social studies teachers in Idaho--even those well trained--were often not given teaching assignments that corresponded with their major and minor fields of preparation.

Bachus (1972) also found that secondary social studies teachers in Arkansas were often not teaching courses in their strongest academic areas.

Academic Preparation of "Social Studies Coaches." Several studies looked specifically at the academic backgrounds of athletic coaches who taught social studies. Pohlmann and Wellman (1960) noted the oft-expressed belief on the part of social studies teachers that there seemed to be a "tendency to hire coaches and then find some classes for them to teach"--usually social studies (p. 312). Pohlmann and Wellman reported that the median hours of academic preparation in social science for all the teachers surveyed in the Illinois study was 57, while for coaches surveyed it was 38 hours. Over one-fifth of the coaches teaching social studies had less than 27 hours in social science; and in every social science course except sociology a larger percentage of coaches than others failed to meet the requirements for the specific courses they were teaching. Table 25 below shows the comparisons by course.

Anderson (1968) reported that one-fifth of the high school social studies teachers in his Idaho survey coached or taught physical education in addition to their social studies assignments. He noted that this group represented the second largest type of teaching combination, exceeded only by the group teaching only social studies courses. He did not mention any preparation

Table 26

Percentage of Teachers Failing to Meet the Minimum State Requirements for the Social Science Courses They Taught in Illinois High Schools in 1956-57

	Non-Coaches	Coaches
Geography	11.8	54.5
Political Science	16.9	41.2
Economics	33.3	40.0
Sociology	36.8	25.0
American History	3.2	17.0
World History	21.4	50.0

(Pohlmann and Wellman 1960, p. 312)

differentials between coaches/physical education teachers and regular social studies teachers in his dissertation abstract.

Miller (1969), in contrast to Pohlmann and Wellman, stated that Ohio coaches who taught social studies were generally as well prepared in subject matter as noncoaches in schools of the same type and size.

Academic Training Requirements for Social Studies Teachers

Training Institutions' Requirements. Moreland (1958) surveyed 50 colleges and universities throughout the country to determine the most common patterns of academic training for social studies teachers. Two patterns emerged: provision for intensive work in any one of the social science disciplines (including history) and provision for a general major in the social studies. The latter appeared to be the predominant approach for most prospective social studies teachers, and was offered in 38 of the 50 institutions. The table below shows the number of institutions offering majors in the various areas, the range of credit hours required, and the median credit hours required for a major.

Table 27

Provisions for Teaching Majors and Requirements in Semester Hours*

Major	Number	Range	Median
Social Studies	38	24-59	40
History	32	15-51	28
Geography	28	13-51	24
Economics	24	13-51	26
Sociology	24	13-51	24
Political Science	23	13-51	25

*For consistency in reporting the data, credit hours reported by those institutions organized on a quarter system have been converted to semester hours by multiplying by two-thirds.

(Moreland 1958, p. 384)

Thirteen institutions offered only the social studies major and four more offered only the social studies and the history majors. In addition to the major areas listed above, one institution offered a major in civics and a major in an area study of the Far East. Another offered a combined English-social studies major. The distribution of credit hours required of the social studies major in 34 of the 38 institutions offering that major are shown in Table 28 below.

The emphasis in the social studies major was on history, with about 40 percent of the credit hours normally given to that field. It should be noted that, in most of the institutions surveyed, students electing a single-discipline major in one of the social sciences were required to take some work in each of the other social sciences. Thus, Moreland noted,

> it would seem that either through the social studies major, or the one in the individual disciplines, the emphasis in these colleges and universities is upon a breadth of training as being essential for a social studies teacher. (p. 386)

Table 28

Distribution of Hours of the Social Sciences for a General Major in the Social Studies

Subject	Number	Percent	Range	Median
History	34	100.	6-24	16
Political Science	30	88.2	3-12	6
Economics	25	73.5	3-12	6
Sociology	24	70.6	3-12	6
Geography	21	61.8	3-12	3

(From Moreland, p. 385)

Gross and Badger (1960), in their comprehensive review of research in social studies education, noted that there appeared to be increasing attempts to build broader social science backgrounds into the preservice training of social studies teachers. However, change in this direction was proceeding only slowly and the teacher education programs of the late fifties still largely resembled those of the twenties and thirties.

Lunstrum (1968) surveyed university and college catalogues to determine what were considered minimal training programs for social studies teachers. His review of 36 catalogues revealed some "interesting variations from the established curriculum pattern 'characterized by a dominant core of one-third to one-half history and a modicum of attention to a selection of other social science disciplines'." (p. 137) Though the variations were not enough to be called a trend, they did reflect concern for requiring greater breadth of preparation in the social sciences.

Johnson (1969) surveyed 93 colleges and universities of the North Central Association. He found that the provisions for academic programs for social studies teachers did not differ much from the sequences provided for non-teaching-bound students. About 90 percent of the schools provided for a depth study in at least one social science discipline, but less than half required two or more social sciences to accompany the depth study. The behavioral sciences, especially anthropology, did not receive sufficient emphasis in the academic portion of the teacher preparation programs. Only about 23 percent of the schools offered interdisciplinary social science courses for prospective teachers.

Seifert (1971) compared the requirements of 30 Indiana teacher education institutions with the state's certification requirements for social studies teachers at the secondary level. He found that all 30 institutions offered a world history endorsement and 29 offered an American history endorsement. Twenty-five offered a sociology endorsement; 23, an economics endorsement; 22, government; and only nine, geography. The institutions tended to require only the minimum number of credits required for state certification in any particular endorsement.

Besonen (1972) analyzed the requirements for social studies teacher preparation in 60 randomly selected teacher training institutions and 15 "social studies leader training institutions." Social studies programs with a history core predominated at both. Programs in both groups were most deficient in, among other things, requiring courses on the non-Western world, urban affairs, ethnic studies, and interdisciplinary social science; and providing instruction in the structure and modes of inquiry in the individual social sciences.

Allen's dissertation (1973) sought to determine whether there had been any changes in the characteristics studied by Moreland (1958). He sent questionnaires to 50 institutions judged by a panel to be conducting superior programs in secondary social studies teacher education; 35 returned responses. All of the respondents provided for "a rigorous introduction" to the social sciences and for breadth of training in the social sciences. Seventy-seven percent of the schools introduced students to "the modes of inquiry in the social sciences." The social studies major entailed a depth study in one field, usually history, and additional study in two or more social sciences. A major change from Moreland's day was that the amount of academic coursework in the social sciences taken by prospective social studies teachers had increased.

Procasky (1974) examined the preparation in geography of prospective secondary geography teachers in Pennsylvania. He found that Pennsylvania teacher training institutions required fewer credits for a geography concentration than a panel of geographers interested in precollege education had deemed necessary. The foundation course most often offered by the institutions and judged most appropriate by the panel was physical geography. The institutions exceeded the panel's recommendations for credit hours to be taken in related social science fields except in the case of anthropology.

Fell (1975) surveyed 52 teacher preparation institutions in Ohio in regard to their academic requirements for secondary social studies teachers. When state and private colleges were compared, it was found that state programs required more total hours credit, a smaller proportion of the total hours to be taken in history, a slightly larger proportion of hours to be taken in the other social sciences, more depth work in supporting areas, and somewhat higher proportion of free electives. All institutions required at least 60 hours of academic preparation and almost all required a full-course introduction to six social science disciplines. All required at least 18 to 24 hours in one of the disciplines, but few required depth and advanced work in at least two additional disciplines. None of the institutions required interdisciplinary courses, syntheses or capstone courses, and courses exposing students to and giving them practice in the methods of inquiry of the several social sciences.

State Certification Requirements. Roeder (1974) provided a table summarizing requirements for certification of elementary teachers in 860 teacher's colleges in the U.S.:

Table 29

Summary of Semester Hours Required for Graduation and State Certification of Elementary Teachers

	No required semester hrs.		*One or two semester hrs.*		*Three semester hrs.*		*Four or five semester hrs.*		*Over five semester hrs.*		*Combined course**		*Unscored***	
Courses	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Reading methods	86	10.0	118	13.7	408	47.4	68	7.9	26	3.0	143	16.6	11	1.3
Language arts	102	11.9	181	21.0	236	27.4	28	3.3	14	1.6	256	29.8	43	5.0
Language arts/reading	750	87.2	9	1.0	57	6.6	35	4.1	7	.8	1	.1	1	.1
Children's literature	168	19.5	162	18.8	396	46.0	23	2.7	4	.5	63	7.3	44	5.1
Children's literature/ language arts	832	96.7	1	.1	14	1.6	8	.9	2	.2	0	0.0	3	.3
Art methods	94	10.9	205	23.8	299	34.8	103	12.0	30	3.5	45	5.2	84	9.8
Industrial arts	788	91.6	15	1.7	14	1.6	2	.2	0	0.0	10	1.2	31	3.6
Music methods	109	12.7	203	23.6	278	32.3	118	13.7	34	4.0	37	4.3	81	9.4
Physical education methods	210	24.4	258	30.0	181	21.0	27	3.1	4	.5	96	11.2	84	9.8
Health methods	328	38.1	188	21.9	119	13.8	14	1.6	5	.6	155	18.0	51	5.9
First aid	675	78.5	50	5.8	16	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	85	9.9	34	4.0
Health/first aid	747	86.9	37	4.3	43	5.0	18	2.1	3	.3	7	.8	5	.6
Audio-visual	423	49.2	128	14.9	98	11.4	4	.5	0	0.0	106	12.3	101	11.7
English methods	653	75.9	33	3.8	30	3.5	6	.7	8	.9	93	10.8	37	4.3
Social studies methods	118	13.7	238	27.7	205	23.8	20	2.3	2	.2	220	25.6	57	6.6
English/social studies	856	99.5	1	.1	2	.2	1	.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
English/language arts/ social studies	825	95.9	3	.3	22	2.6	5	.6	0	0.0	4	.5	1	.1
Math methods	43	5.0	182	21.2	255	29.7	72	8.4	121	14.1	154	17.9	33	3.8
Science methods	96	11.2	222	25.8	198	23.0	34	4.0	16	1.9	237	27.6	57	6.6
Math/science methods	788	91.6	10	1.2	37	4.3	19	2.2	2	.2	3	.3	1	.1
Combined methods	527	61.3	16	1.9	86	10.0	59	6.9	81	9.4	18	2.1	73	8.5
Physical education	126	14.7	232	27.0	65	7.6	261	30.3	39	4.5	9	1.0	128	14.9
Religion	447	52.0	8	.9	55	6.4	36	4.2	269	31.3	0	0.0	45	5.2
Art history/appreciation	277	32.2	147	17.1	169	19.7	34	4.0	12	1.4	68	7.9	153	17.8
Music history/appreciation	305	35.5	149	17.3	158	18.4	23	2.7	8	.9	68	7.9	149	17.3
Art/music	787	91.6	7	.8	26	3.0	17	2.0	21	2.4	1	.1	0	0.0
State history	628	73.0	44	5.1	101	11.7	4	.5	7	.8	7	.8	69	8.0
Evaluation	495	57.6	104	12.1	154	17.9	10	1.2	2	.2	62	7.2	33	3.8
Geography	343	39.9	45	5.2	277	32.2	47	5.5	76	8.8	16	1.9	56	6.5

**Combined Course.* The responses included in this category were defined as courses in which the contents of two or more courses were combined into a single unit, e.g., reading and language arts.

***Unscored.* The responses which comprise this category include: confused responses, courses which were offered within a range of possible choices, and responses which did not provide sufficient data. □

(Reoder 1974, p. 349)

The certification requirements for history and social science coursework for elementary teachers and secondary social studies teachers are shown in Appendix Tables A-6 and A-7. The information contained in these tables was drawn from a series of compilations of certification requirements published annually by the University of Chicago Press (Woellner and Wood 1955-56; Woellner and Wood 1965-66; and Woellner 1975-76). The requirements of each state in three different years (1955-56; 1965-66; and 1975-76) are displayed.

From these tables, it appears that there was no trend either toward or away from including social science coursework in the state certification requirements for secondary social studies teachers and elementary teachers. The explicit mention of the term social science instead of social studies and of the specific social sciences among the requirements remained at about the same level throughout the period, with 13 to 19 states mentioning such requirements. At the elementary level, 13 states in the 1955-56 period mentioned social science or specific social sciences among the requirements; in 1965-66, 18 states did so; and in 1975-76, 16 states. At the secondary level, 19 states mentioned social sciences or specific social sciences in 1955-56; 17, in 1965-66; and 16 in 1975-76. Some states would use the term social science in the early period and drop it later, while others would use it throughout, and still others would pick it up only in the middle and/or later periods. Thus, the picture is largely one of fluctuation. (It should be noted that, in counting "mentions of specific social sciences," we did not count states that only mentioned political science and geography, since these have been included in social studies requirements for some time. We were only interested in states that mentioned the "newer" areas--economics, sociology, social psychology, psychology, and anthropology.)

Although it would appear that there is no particular trend when looking at the use of the term social science and sepcific social sciences as a group, a different picture might emerge using a different criterion. This is the case when one uses the two terms anthropology and behavioral science(s). Examination of the number of specific mentions of these two terms in each period shows a trend toward increasing attention to these areas. At the elementary level, no state mentioned anthropology or behavioral sciences as required courses or courses allowable in meeting the social studies requirement in 1955-56; one state mentioned anthropology and another mentioned behavioral sciences as allowable or required in 1965-66; and one state mentioned anthropology and two others mentioned behavioral sciences as allowable or required in 1975-76. At the secondary level, two states mentioned anthropology as allowable or required in 1955-56; three states mentioned anthropology as allowable or required in 1955-56; three states mentioned anthropology and one other mentioned behavioral sciences in 1965-66; and four states mentioned anthropology and two others behavioral sciences in 1975-76.

Characteristics of Teacher Educators

In 1963 Searles (1965) surveyed teacher educators, following up a study he did in 1952. He found that 77 percent (68 of 88) held a doctorate in 1963 and that 50 percent of these had received the degree in the last ten years, 35 percent had received the degree in the last 20, and 17 percent in the last 30 years. The field of concentration for the degree is shown in Table 30. The amount of experience the sample had had is shown in Table 31. The courses most frequently taught by the 88 teachers surveyed were principles of education (13), general methods (16), and supervision of student teachers (18). History and/or social science courses were mentioned by 38, with history predominating. This pattern is different from the 1952 pattern, with 42 percent teaching history/social science in 1963 compared to 27 percent in 1952.

The positions of those surveyed are shown in Table 32. Searles noted that the pattern of positions in 1963 compared with the 1952 study showed "little change other than that there may now be a greater emphasis on social science subject matter" (p. 448).

The 21 colleges and universities surveyed by Searles reported graduating about 2.5 doctorates in social studies education per year. Requirements for

Table 30.

BACKGROUND OF METHODS TEACHERS—TRAINING

	Number of Institutions			
	1952	1963		
		Without Graduate Programs	With Graduate Programs	Total
Degree				
Ed.D.	15	16	8	24
Ph.D.	63	31	13	44
M.A.	40	15	1	16
Date Granted				
1953-1963		31	13	44
1943-1952	52	25	5	30
1930-1942	51	12	3	15
Field of Concentration				
History/social science				
Doctorate		18	6	24
Master		43	12	55
Total doctorate/master	48	61	18	79
Undergraduate	89	58	17	75
Education				
Doctorate		29	15	44
Master		24	11	35
Total doctorate/master	73	53	26	79
Undergraduate	6	4	2	6
Other				
Doctorate		0	0	0
Master		3	1	4
Total doctorate/master	4	3	1	4
Undergraduate	24	15	1	16
History/Social Science Credits				
31-55		26	5	31
55-90		18	10	28
91-135		17	5	22

(Searles 1965, p. 446)

selection into the doctoral programs of these schools included three years of high school teaching, 35 credit hours in social sciences, and 24 credits in professional education courses. Most asked for a B average and over half asked for evidence of research activity. In more than half the schools, the doctoral candidate was required to take from ten to 30 hours in history/social sciences; and in half of these schools, the hours had to be taken in one field only. About 40 credit hours in education courses were required (nine in social

Table 31.

BACKGROUND OF METHODS TEACHERS—EXPERIENCE

	Number of Institutions			
	1952	1963		
		Without Graduate Programs	With Graduate Programs	Total
Years Teaching Methods Course				
1-10	89	55	15	70
11-20	22	11	6	17
21-30	15	3	1	4
Years of Teaching in Secondary Schools				
1-10	67	47	18	65
11-20	32	13	2	15
21-30	13	7	1	8
Time of Last Teaching in Secondary School				
1-10	62	22	11	33
11-20	21	3	7	10
21-30	23	17	4	21
Currently	16	8	2	10

(Searless 1965, p. 447)

Table 32.

BACKGROUND OF METHODS TEACHERS—POSITION ON COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FACULTY

	Number of Institutions			
	1952	1963		
		Without Graduate Programs	With Graduate Programs	Total
Department Assignment				
Secondary education		27	13	40
Education		12	2	14
History, social science		23	3	26
Joint appointment		2	2	4
Other Courses Taught				
Education (miscellaneous)	76	25	12	37
Principles of secondary education	19	10	3	13
General methods	21	15	1	16
Supervision of student teachers	22	14	4	18
History/social science	27	33	5	38

(Searles 1965, p. 447)

foundations, seven in educational psychology, six in teaching the social studies, and nine in curriculum and supervision). Half of the institutions reported requiring some student apprentice activity, such as a graduate assistantship or supervision of student teaching.

Elish (1973) surveyed 56 methods instructors in 52 colleges and universities in Ohio in the spring of 1973. These constituted 100 percent of those teaching secondary methods in that term. He found that 75 percent were under 45 years of age and males predominated by a 4:1 ratio. All but 17 percent were employed full time. Over 71 percent supervised student teachers. Except for the teaching associates, all methods instructors at state universities held doctorates and 50 percent at private schools held doctorates. More of the social studies methods instructors (83.61 percent) than general methods instructors (59.1 percent) were academically prepared in social sciences. Both the secondary school teaching experience and the methods teaching experience of the instructors were limited. In general, the methods instructors were not professionally active. Seventy-two percent of the methods courses offered in the 52 institutions were controlled by the departments of education. The Hunt and Metcalf methods text was the most popular in the state.

Tucker (1972) was interested in a different sort of social studies teacher educator characteristic. In 1969 he surveyed a random sample (stratified geographically) of 234 of the 806 college/university educators who were members of the National Council for the Social Studies. Of the 50.9 percent of the returned questionnaires, 103 were instructors in preservice, secondary-level teacher training progams. These were used for analysis. The respondents saw two very distinct roles within the "new social studies"--developmental and educational. They identified the first role wholly with the development projects and they did not see themselves as having a major role in this.

Instead, they saw their preservice courses as fulfilling the educational role. Further, they were not happy with this division of labor: "they wished to retain the upper hand with respect to the educational role, [and at the same time] they preferred that the developmental role be shifted away from the USOE and NSF projects, and to a much greater degree placed in the hands of classroom teachers . . ."(p. 550). They did not see themselves as taking over the development role, however.

Also, the respondents were generally not pleased by what they saw as "an overly scholarly, cognitive, 'structure-of-the-discipline' approach to social studies education" in the "new social studies" projects. They wanted more attention to be given to normative, interdisciplinary, affective, and community-centered aspects of social studies. Attitudes toward what ought to be happening in the social studies were closely tied to departmental affiliation, however. Those holding appointments in schools of education showed greater disaffection from the "new social studies" projects than those holding appointments in academic departments.

Among Tucker's overall conclusions was the suggestion that most methods professors in social studies would not be highly likely to help promote the work of the projects. The projects had, in a sense, circumvented schools of education and gone directly to the elementary and secondary schools in their dissemination efforts; as a result, many methods professors had not had a chance to become familiar with the projects and had, in a sense, been made somewhat "obsolescent" by them. Further, the splitting up of the roles of developer and educator, which had formerly been combined in many methods professors who were both textbook writers and methods teachers, increased the uneasiness of the methods professors. Also the projects approach was at odds with a common conception held by methods professors, of the teacher as developer of his/her own curricula: "...methods teachers tend to want a kind of social studies that is not easily prepackaged" (pp. 553-54).

Thompson (1973) pursued some of the questions raised by Tucker's findings. He sent questionnaires to 500 secondary social studies methods teachers randomly selected from all state four-year colleges, private four-year colleges, and public and private universities granting doctorates in education in the U.S. Two hundred ninety-eight (59.6 percent) of the questionnaires were returned. Thompson found that 94 percent of the respondents had taught previously at the secondary level and 44 percent held an academic degree outside the field of education. Over half (53.6 percent) reported having received training in the use of materials and strategies from one or more "new social studies" projects. The greatest amount of support for any single rationale for the "new social studies" was for the "process and structure of the disciplines" rationale, supported by 36.6 percent. The most commonly reported obstacle to acquiring "new social studies" materials was financial and difficulty in obtaining the project materials was a matter of great concern among the instructors surveyed. Eleven percent reported no "new social studies" materials were available to their students. More than 80 percent of the respondents said they had organized new courses or reoriented existing courses to involve "new social studies" as a major component. Thompson found that Tucker's "value-conflict theory"--that methods professors' dissatisfaction with the projects stemmed largely from the projects' lack of stress on certain values--did have validity. Thompson also found a "misalignment" between the attitudes of methods instructors and the directions taken by the projects, but he concluded that there was "no meaningful opposition . . . among methods teachers to the new social studies" (abstract). Further, there was a "misalignment regarding the attitudes toward social studies between instructors with degrees in the field of education and those with backgrounds in social science and history," confirming the differences found by Tucker (abstract). Finally, Thompson concluded that methods instructors in four-year private colleges had the greatest need for upgrading their social studies methods courses.

Inservice Training of Social Studies Teachers

Kirby (1964) found that most junior high school social studies teachers in his Colorado sample continued their formal education beyond the bachelor's degree, but relatively few engaged in programs directly related to teaching junior high school social studies courses.

Wood (1966) found that the social studies inservice activities most often conducted by Missouri high schools were, in rank order, in-session workshops, faculty meetings concerned with special problems of teachers, and pre-term workshops.

Portzline (1966) summarized two evaluation surveys of the 1965 NDEA institutes in geography and history. In 1965--the first year in which institutes were held in social studies areas--40 geography institutes and 84 history institutes took place, at a cost of more than five million dollars. The evaluators of both kinds of institute found that, on the whole, the content, methods, and materials used in the institutes were of a quite traditional variety. In practice, the emphasis was on transmission of factual knowledge, although this goal was rarely cited as a primary objective. Lecture or lecture plus question-and-answer sessions were the predominant modes of instruction and very little use was made of educational media such as overhead transparencies, television, and tape recordings. Participants indicated that little attention was given to classroom applications. The institute staff members were judged to be inadequately aware of school programs, new materials, and modern teaching techniques.

Godwin (1967) determined that less than one-half of the elementary teachers in Nebraska school districts without a full-time elementary curriculum director had completed a college or university course in methods of teaching social studies or attended a workshop, institute, or inservice program in social studies in the elementary schools since 1960. Saunders (1968), surveying Nebraska elementary teachers in school districts with a full-time elementary curriculum director, found that less than half had completed a college or university course in methods of teaching social studies since 1960 and a little over one-fourth had attended a workshop, institute, or inservice program since then.

A study by Malament (1968) of the orientation given beginning senior high social studies teachers in New York City found that new teachers found the most valuable practices to be individual conferences with the department chairpersons, assistance with clerical work and discipline, and a reduced teaching load the first year. Least valuable practices were seminars or institutes for new teachers conducted by nearby colleges or universities, guided tours of the neighborhood, social events of the department, school, or community, the Board of Education handbook, and meetings and publications of professional associations.

Kaltsounis (1968) noted that NEA survey in 1966 found the following types of activities counted as meeting professional growth requirements in 307 school systems across the U.S.:

College course for credit
Workshop or inservice training sponsored by school system
Travel
Noncredit courses or institutes not sponsored by school systems
Research
Work on school committees

Professional writings
Attendance at professional conferences and conventions
Supervision of student teaching
Holding office in professional associations
Committee work in professional associations
Community projects
Work experience
Other (includes writing instructional materials, college and university teaching, lecturing, and civic activities)

(Kaltsounis 1968, p. 701)

Kaltsounis commented that the survey did not break out those activities counting specifically as social studies professional growth requirements; however, a group of nine teachers who participated in an NDEA institute indicated that "social studies as a focus for inservice education continues to receive very little attention, if any at all" (p. 701). Only two of the nine teachers served in systems that had some kind of inservice education in social studies. The most popular form appeared to be the workshop, usually initiated by the administration, taking place after a full day's work, and requiring teachers to attend. Teacher involvement was usually quite low and the mode of presentation was usually telling rather than demonstrating or interacting. Kaltsounis did note that a form of inservice education that had become increasingly popular during the previous few years was the government-sponsored institute in history and social science. However, these had been criticized for emphasizing "tough" graduate content to the exclusion of opportunities to learn how to use the newly acquired knowledge in precollege classrooms.

Two studies (Miller 1969 and Bachus 1972) found that social studies teachers lacked a strong professional consciousness, as measured by membership in professional organizations and reading of professional literature. Further, Jone (1971) found that social studies teachers and English teachers tended to be more "education oriented" but less "subject centered" than math and science teachers. These characteristics may have some bearing on the kinds of inservice professional development programs that are possible and effective with social studies teachers.

Summary Observations

1) A substantial number of secondary social studies teachers during the fifties and sixties had majored in fields other than history and the social sciences. Of those who did have majors in history and social science in the fifties and sixties, most had majored in history, especially American history.

2) The social studies areas in which secondary social studies teachers as a group in the fifties and sixties were least well prepared academically were economics, geography, sociology, and especially, anthropology.

3) Although there were few studies of elementary teacher preparation in the social studies, it would appear that elementary teachers were not well prepared in history and the social sciences.

4) It appears that secondary social studies teachers with history/social science preparation are often not assigned to teach courses in social studies areas for which they are prepared. In the late fifties and sixties, at least, there appeared to be a tendency to assign teachers who were poorly prepared in history/social science, such as athletic coaches, to teach social studies.

5) Only two post-1970 studies (both dissertations) were found bearing on the actual academic preparation of social studies teachers. From these, we cannot tell clearly whether the picture presented above might have changed recently, although the studies do hint that the situation remains the same as in the fifties and sixties.

6) In the fifties and sixties, the academic training pattern for preservice secondary social studies teachers offered by teacher training institutions was characterized by the dominance of courses in history with some additional work spread among some of the social sciences. This may have changed somewhat by the late sixties, with greater emphasis being accorded the social sciences; however, the history core still appears to be dominant. Some studies noted a lack of interdisciplinary and capstone courses to help students integrate their work in the separate social science disciplines. Also, social science courses for preservice teachers appear not to emphasize the inquiry methods of the disciplines sufficiently.

7) One cannot discern any particular trends over the 20-year period, 1955-1975, toward or away from inclusion of social sciences in the state certification requirements for secondary social studies teachers and elementary teachers. The explicit mention of the term social science instead of social studies and of the specific social sciences among the requirements remained at about the same level throughout the period, with 13 to 19 states mentioning such requirements. (However, if one were to take only two terms, anthropology and behavioral science(s) as the criterion, a different trend picture would emerge, showing an increase in attention to these areas.

8) Some information is available on the changes in characteristics of social

studies teacher educators (methods professors) from the early fifties to the early sixties. Among other things, there was a trend toward teacher educators' teaching more history/social science courses instead of only education courses. No recent information in this regard was found.

9) One relatively recent survey of social studies methods professors showed them to have attitudes toward the "new social studies" projects that would be likely to inhibit their use of the products of these projects in training preservice teachers. A follow-up to that study, however, indicated that the projects may have had greater impact on methods professors' practices than the first study had suggested.

10) The literature describing practices in social studies inservice training is rather spotty.

Section 2.0

RESEARCH ON THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF PRACTICES IN SOCIAL STUDIES/SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

2.1 Introduction
2.2 An Overview of Research in Social Studies/Social Science Education
2.3 Research on Effectiveness of Different Kinds of Content in Social Studies/Social Science Education
2.4 Research on Effectiveness and Efficienty of Social Studies/Social Science Instructional Methods and Techniques
2.5 Research on Effectiveness and Efficiency of Social Studies/Social Science Educational Materials
2.6 Research on the Effects of Learner Variables in Social Studies/Social Science Education
2.7 Research on the Effectiveness of the "New Social Studies"
2.8 Research on the Social and Political Knowledge, Skill, and Attitudes Outcomes of Schooling
2.9 Research on Teacher Education in Social Studies/Social Science Education

2.1 Introduction

This section of the report consists of eight major subsections, as listed on the previous page. All focus on the question of the effectiveness of various practices in social studies/social science education. The matter of efficiency of practices is mentioned only rarely, since hardly any research exists in this area.

With the exception of subsection 2.8 (on outcomes of schooling), all the subsections are based on reports of research efforts that sought to discover relationships among variables. This kind of research, labeled "scientific," is contrasted by Kerlinger with "status surveys," which seek "to learn the status quo rather than to study the relations among variables" (Kerlinger 1964, p. 392). Status studies were the main kind of source used in the subsection 2.8, as well as Section 1.0 of this report (on the state of practices).

Since obtaining and reading all the reports of research studies conducted during the last 20 years was impossible within the time constraints of this project, we instead relied primarily on reviews of research. These sources are described in the overview subsection (2.2), immediately following this introduction. The overview not only describes the sources used in this section, but also presents a picture of the state of research in the field in general and offers a number of conclusions about research in social studies/social science education. The subsequent subsections then present conclusions from the research, that is, generalizations regarding the substantive findings of the research.

A word about the placement of the subsection on outcomes of schooling (2.8) is in order here. We debated whether to put this in Section 1.0, on the state of practices in the field, since subsection 2.8 deals with status variables, too. However, outcomes are not practices and they appear to be at least as relevant to the question of effectiveness as to the question of status. Therefore, we placed the outcomes subsection within the effectiveness section, even though, for the most part, the studies in 2.8 did not attempt to connect outcomes to independent variables.

2.2 An Overview of Research in Social Studies Education

This subsection focuses on the state of research in social studies education, while later subsections examine the findings of that research. A brief sketch of the history of social studies research efforts is given first, followed by discussions of the amount of research in the field, the problem of developing a cumulative research base, the topics of research in the field, the methodologies of researchers, the grade levels on which research is done, and a few miscellaneous items.

Sources

The observations listed on pages 261 to 263 are based upon an examination of reviews of research in social studies/social science education covering the period 1955 through 1975. Three types of reviews were examined:

1) "comprehensive" reviews--that is, reviews that attempted to report on research in all areas of social studies/social science education covering the period 1955 through 1975. Three types of reviews were examined:
    a) Annual reviews (that is, reviews of research reported during a one-year period);
    b) Multiyear reviews (covering periods of three or five or ten years) composed of several rather discrete special-focus chapters; and
    c) multiyear reviews without such distinct subdivisions.
2) "special-focus" reviews--that is, reveiws that attempted to examine only one particular segment of the field, such as citizenship and political socialization or simulations and games in the social studies.
3) compilations of dissertation abstracts in the field.

A total of 52 reviews were consulted for this section of the report. (The term review, as used here, includes some items that are really not much more than annotated bibliographies of research. Although these sources do not interpret and summarize the research, they are useful in giving some indication of the volume of research and topics of interest in particular areas.) All but five of these reviews focused specifically on social studies research. The five, which are asterisked in the table that follows, examined research in educational areas beyond the social studies and were consulted in order to obtain some perspective on the state of social studies research on particular topics in comparison to research outside the social studies on those topics.

Table 33

Research Reviews Consulted

Comprehensive Reviews

Annual Reviews:	Harrison and Solomon (1965) Cox, Girault, and Metcalf (1966) Girault and Cox (1967) Cox, Johnson, and Payette (1968) Johnson, Payette, and Cox (1969) Payette, Cox, and Johnson (1970) Cox and Johnson (1972)
Multiyear Reviews Composed of Special-focus Chapters:	Massialas and Smith (1965) Hunkins et al. (1977)
Multiyear Reviews Without Special-focus Chapters:	Gross and Badger (1960) Harrison and Solomon (1964) Skretting and Sundeen (1969)

Special-focus Reviews

Teacher Education:	Fair (1965) Grannis (1970) Weintraub (1970) Rosenshine (1972)
Simulation/Games:	Cherryholems (1966) Fletcher (1971) Wentworth and Lewis (1973) Bagley (1974) Chapman et al. (1974)
Critical Thinking, Etc.:	Fersh (1955) Gross and Mac Donald (1958) Shaver (1962) Metcalf (1963) *Hermann (1969) Hawkins and Templeton (1972) Templeton and Hawkins (1972) Shaver and Larkins (1973) Marsh (1974) Rice (1974) Feely (1976)

Specific Instructional Techniques:	Dimond (1960) Massialas (1969) Patrick (1969)
Economic Education:	Baker (1960) Dawson (1969) Dawson (1970)
Geographic Education	Saveland and Pannell (1975)
Elementary Social Studies:	Dunfee (1970)
Reading and Social Studies:	Lunstrum and Taylor (1977)
Values Education:	Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) Kirschenbaum (1975)
"New Social Studies" Materials:	Wiley and Superka (1977)

Compilations of Dissertations

McPhie (1964)
Gross and De La Cruz (1971)
Chapin (1974)

We are as certain as it is possible to be that all comprehensive reviews of research in the social studies for the period 1955-1975 have been identified. Although an effort was made to identify all the special-focus reviews available in social studies, undoubtedly some were missed. Unlike comprehensive reviews of research, special-focus reviews are not always clearly labeled "review" in the title. Since some were located only by accident, we feel relatively certain there are others "out there" waiting to be discovered. Also, a few of these kinds of reviews proved to be unobtainable.

Subsection 2.8, which examines surveys of student outcomes, is based on sources other than the above-listed reviews of research. These sources are described at the beginning of subsection 2.8.

Documentation and Discussion

Historical Perspective

In 1916, social studies was born--or at least christened. In that year, the name "social studies" was bestowed on the field, which had come to be more or less "officially" recognized as a distinctive segment of the school curriculum.

However, it was not until about a half century later that research in the field truly blossomed. Prior to 1960, there had been only two comprehensive reviews of research in social studies education. The first was published in 1941 (Murra, Wesley, and Zink) and the second in 1950 (Carr, Wesley, and Murra), both under the auspices of the American Educational Research Association in its Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Neither of these reviews is dealt with in this report, since they precede the assigned period, 1955 through 1975.

It was another decade before a third review of research in social studies appeared, again in the Encyclopedia (Gross and Badger 1960). Shortly after this, social studies educators themselves--through their own organizational auspices--began to sponsor research reviews and the reviews began to appear more frequently. Starting in 1964, the National Council for the Social Studies initiated an annual review of research, to be published in its journal, Social Education. The 1964 review (Harrison and Solomon) brought readers up to date since the 1960 review, covering the period 1960 through 1963; each year following there appeared an annual review article (Harrison and Solomon 1965; Cox, Girault, and Metcalf 1966; Girault and Cox 1967; Cox, Johnson, and Payette 1968; Johnson, Payette, and Cox 1969; and Payette, Cox, and Johnson 1970). Also during this period two multiyear reviews appeared elsewhere; in 1965 a volume focusing primarily on the period 1958 through 1963 was published commercially (Massialas and Smith) and in 1969 a ten-year review appeared in the Encyclopedia of Education (Skretting and Sundeen).

Social Education decided to curtail the practice of publishing annual reviews at the end of the sixties. One other annual review of social studies research appeared, covering research done in 1970, but not in Social Education (it was published by the Indiana Social Studies Quarterly) and not until 1972. This year (1977), the National Council for the Social Studies is cosponsoring, along with the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and the Social Science Education Consortium, a five-year review of social studies research.

It is not clear why the annual reviews were stopped, for certainly research activity in the field had not decreased. It may be--in fact, it is likely that--both researchers and practitioners did not find the annual reviews to be very useful. The writers of annual reviews were extremely hesitant to comment on the research reported. In most cases, these reviews were annotated bibliographies in narrative form, certainly not designed to give practical guidance to classroom teachers and only providing minimal help to researchers. Indeed, it would be extremely difficult to detect trends based on a review of only one year's work in the field and it would be asking too much for reviewers to venture interpretations on research scattered across all aspects of the field.

It appears that future reviews of research are likely to follow one or both of two directions: multiyear reviews will provide an opportunity to discern trends and cumulative development in research, while special-focus reviews will allow reviewers to single out discrete topics for careful interpretation. There does, indeed, appear to be a trend toward topical reviews covering research done over several years' time; the number of special-focus reviews located in this survey increased during the sixties and early seventies.

Amount of Social Studies Research

The amount of research activity in social studies--as indicated by a rough count of the number of research reports cited in each comprehensive review--

has been increasing fairly steadily since 1960. (In counting research studies, an attempt was made to eliminate purely theoretical treatises, methods texts, other reviews of research, and the like. As much as possible, the numbers below indicate only reports of specific research projects.)

The annual reviews show a slight dip in amount of research done during the mid-sixties:

Table 34

Amount of Research--Annual Reviews

Review	No. of Studies
Harrison and Solomon, covering 1964	76
Cox, Girault, and Metcalf, covering 1965	74
Girault and Cox, covering 1966	56
Cox, Johnson, and Payette, covering 1967	81
Johnson, Payette, and Cox, covering 1968	118
Payette, Cox, and Johnson, covering 1969	136
Cox and Johnson, covering 1970	182

Overall, this is a rather dramatic increase, more than doubling the amount of research in the field during a seven-year period.

The pattern is not so clear in the multiyear reviews, since most of those were selective and the numbers of years covered were not always clearly delineated. Nevertheless, the figures may be worth noting:

Table 35

Amount of Research--Multiyear Reviews

Review	No. of Studies
Gross and Badger, covering pre-1960 research	274
Harrison and Solomon, covering four years 1960-63	124
Massialas and Smith, covering six years 1958-63 plus some earlier	336

Skretting and Sundeen, covering ten years 1959-68 (highly selective)	95
Hunkins et al., covering six years 1970-75 plus some earlier	385

The compilations of doctoral dissertations in the field may provide the clearest indication of trends in the amount of research activity in the field. Several of the comprehensive reviewers noted that doctoral dissertations compose the largest percentage of research studies in social studies. The three compilations of dissertations cover the period 1934 through March 1973. A total of 1,199 dissertations are listed. (The actual total done would be somewhat smaller than this, since there is some overlap between Gross-De La Cruz's and Chapin's cataloguing for 1969.)

Table 36

Amount of Research--Dissertations

Compilation	No. of Dissertations
McPhie, covering 1934-1962 inclusive	566
Gross and De La Cruz, covering 1963-1969 inclusive	216
Chapin, covering 1969 through March 1973	417

Chapin noted that, during the mid-sixties, approximately 50 dissertations were being approved per year; but from 1969 to 1973, 100 were being produced per year.

The Problem of a Cumulative Research Base

Several reviewers have expressed concern over the lack of cumulativeness of social studies educational research. In 1965 Cox and Cousins (in Massialas and Smith 1965) pointed out that most of the research in social studies was done by doctoral candidates and that these studies typically did not contribute to building a systematic data base to test sophisticated theories of method. They noted that there had been only a few attempts to mount concerted and integrated inquiry in the field, most of these having been conducted prior to the sixties. (They cite the Eight-Year Study reported in 1942, the Miami Experiment in Democratic, Action-Centered Education reported in 1948, the Detroit Citizenship Education Study reported in 1953, Bayles' experiments at the University of Kansas reported in 1956, and their own Indiana Experiments in Inquiry reported in 1963. The only other large-scale, coordinated, team research efforts cited in the comprehensive reviews are the Stanford Social Education Study reported in 1948 and the University of Georgia's efforts directed by Marion Rice over the last decade.)

Several years later, the same complaint appeared again. Johnson, Payette, and Cox (1969) and Payette, Cox, and Johnson (1970) noted that the bulk of research studies in the field were done by doctoral candidates. For instance, 74 percent of the studies done in 1968 were dissertations. Payette et al. (1970) drew the following implications from this:

> Two important consequences follow from this preponderance of dissertation research. The first is that most of the research lacks continuity since the dissertation is usually the first publishable work performed by the investigator. The second consequence is that most of the research neglects the study of broad and fundamental problems since the dissertation is predominantly the work of an individual with limited time and financial resources.

As further indication of lack of continuity, they noted that only six of the investigators cited for 1968 had also been cited in the previous year's review.

Gross and De La Cruz (1971) found that, overall, social studies doctoral dissertations were "fragmented": few related to one another or built upon one another and few were part of any overall design or large-scale research program. There were very few longitudinal studies or studies that reached across grade levels. They often produced mixed and conflicting results. The failure to prove anything at all was particularly disturbing to Gross and De La Cruz. This could be attributed at least in part to the field's being only on the threshold of "scientific" experimentation; but also dissertations attempted to encompass too many elements, followed weak designs, and used inadequate or improper instrumentation. Such factors foreordained disappointing results. Gross and De La Cruz suggested that much of the responsibility for this situation rested on the shoulders of faculty in schools of education who failed to give adequate guidance to doctoral candidates.

The lack-of-continuity theme was picked up again by Tucker (in Hunkins et al. 1977). He attributed the noncumulative nature of social studies research in teacher education to a lack of clarity about what social studies is, among other things. Tucker was somewhat optimistic about the potential for building on past research in the field, however. He detected several "emerging lines of research" and urged his readers to follow up on them.

The central message of two of the special-focus reviews concerned the problem of cumulativeness. Metcalf (1963) was perhaps the first of any reviewers to reflect on the fragmentary character of social studies research efforts and the consequent inconclusiveness of findings. He attributed this to the atheoretical, or even antitheoretical, stance of most social studies researchers and argued that they would continue to flail about until they directed their research efforts to theory-based problems. Shaver and Larkins (1973) also argued for theory-based research. Like Tucker (and before him), they contended that research must be grounded on specific conceptions of what social studies is. They advocated a conception of social studies as citizenship education; citizenship education was defined, in turn, as education for critical thinking or reflective inquiry.

Amidst all this wringing of hands over the purported lack of cumulative research in the social studies, one begins to wonder if the minor premise--that there is, in fact, no cumulative knowledge base--is true. Many of the reviews of research--particularly the annual reviews--do give the discouraging impression that research efforts are uncoordinated and more confusing than enlightening. But at least some of this impression stems from the fact that the reviewers do not organize and interpret the disparate bits and pieces of research that they describe. (Some do not even report major conclusions of studies; they only give design and procedural information.) The possibility that this negative impression may be erroneous comes to mind when one reads the few reviewers who have attempted to tease meaning and order our of numerous small, uncoordinated studies (and a few series of coordinated studies) on limited topics conducted over a period of years. For instance, Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) has pieced together some practical guidelines produced by research on factual and conceptual learning. Some special-focus reviews move in this direction, too. Perhaps there are a number of areas in which the research base is there, waiting for someone to analyze and wring the meaning from it.

This is not to fault the reviewers who are reticent to comment. In many cases they have been severely constrained by the assignments given them. For instance, the annual reviews were limited to covering research from only a single year, but had to cover everything in social studies for that year. It is difficult if not impossible to detect trends and cumulative findings in a single year's work; and the difficulty is increased when one must examine research on myriad questions rather than closely examine a few studies on one or two topics. In addition, reviewers are often constrained by the amount of time they can devote to the task; reviews of research are not known to attract substantial amounts of financial support to release reviewers from their other duties.

Neither are we claiming that the problem of building a cumulative research base in the social studies is merely a matter of improving reviews and thereby "discovering" that the answers to all our questions have really been there all along. However, careful attention to already-existing research is likely to reveal that we "know" something more than we think we know. Certainly this would help us to target our future research efforts more carefully and avoid rehashing points that have been studied sufficiently. Glass (1976) has suggested an approach to "milking" existing research that goes beyond even the traditional review: "meta-analysis." He uses the term

> to refer to the statistical analysis of a large collection of analysis results from individual studies for the purpose of integrating the findings. It connotes a rigorous alternative to the casual, narrative discussions of research studies which typify our attempts to make sense of the rapidly expanding research literature. (p. 3)

Pulling meaning and practical guidelines out of the apparently confusing and contradictory results of existing research may require that we come to regard the tasks of reviewers as full-fledged research projects in themselves, meriting the same levels of academic respectability and funding as projects dealing in "original" research.

Research Topics

In many studies reported in the comprehensive reviews, curriculum content (e.g., geography, history, anthropology) was at least one major status variable and sometimes content was used as an independent variable. Not surprisingly, geography and history (both U.S. and world) received by far the most attention, with civicx/government and economics following at some distance. Anthropology and sociology trailed far behind and psychology received only scant mention. Ethnic studies experienced an upsurge of interest during 1969, which was maintained through 1975. The level of attention to it and to controversial issues as subject matter has been about the same as attention to anthropology and sociology. Controversial issues have been a persistent theme, although interest appears to have declined a bit in the seventies. Current events and communism were areas of interest in the early sixties, but attention dwindled to nothing in recent years. International relations/world affairs/global studies/area studies is a cluster of topics in which there has been low, but sustained interest over the years. Until about 1970, there were a few studies each year on the social sciences in general as components of the social studies curriculum.

Another ever-popular topic of research has been the effects of instructional techniques and methods. Numerous researchers have attempted to establish the superiority of one technique or method over another--discussion versus lecture; "inquiry" versus "traditional"; simulation/games, "participation," grouping strategies, role playing, programmed learning, questioning strategies, and so forth versus something else. Particularly strong and continuing interest has been shown in an area variously labeled critical thinking, reflective thinking, inquiry, conceptual learning, higher-cognitive-level thinking, and problem solving. Among the reviewers who comment at all on the research on instructional methods, there has been a persistent lamentation about the discouraging lack of telling results from the tremendous amount of research done in this area. Not until recently (Martorella, in Hunkins et al. 1977) has there been any indication from the reviews that we might have learned even a smidgeon from all these efforts.

Most of the research on instruction has used student cognitive gain as the outcome variable. However, attention to affective outcomes has increased rather steadily since the mid-sixties. In the mid-sixties, the annual reviewers called upon social studies educators to give more classroom and research attention to the affective domain, to which they had traditionally given so much lip service. By the mid-seventies, this call seemed to have been answered; a major portion of the 1977 review (Ehman, in Hunkins et al. 1977) was devoted to reviewing research on values and attitudes in the social studies.

Numerous studies in which textbooks were analyzed and compared are reported in all the comprehensive reviews. The three major analytical foci, according to a tally of such studies mentioned by comprehensive reviews, are readability, bias, and inclusion of various kinds of content (especially social science content). [Somewhat different emphases appeared from our own count of materials analyses, reported in Section 1.0.] These studies almost always find major shortcomings in textbooks; the one notable positive finding is that studies of trends in treatment of blacks in texts have found some improvement in recent years. It has been pointed out (Ehman, in Hunkins et al. 1977) that there is no research on the effects of bias (and other characteristics of texts) on student cognitive and affective growth.

There has been some research using learner characteristics, capabilities, behaviors, and dispositions as independent variables, although for the most part learner variables are considered dependent variables in the social studies research reviewed. A rather remarkable pendular swing appears to have taken place over the last decade in social studies research on learner variables. In the mid-sixties, reviewers noted a number of studies were calling the notion of readiness into question. The Brunerian notion that any child can be taught anything at any age seems to have held sway at that time. In the mid-seventies, however, the idea of readiness in the form of Piagetian developmental stages appears to have gained relative dominance, at least in the research community.

Teacher education is a topic that has gained substantially in popularity among social studies researchers. Although all the comprehensive reviewers devoted at least a few paragraphs to teacher education, Fair (1965) pointed out that research in the area was still sparse in the mid-sixties. But since that time, the amount of research in this area has increased. Tucker (in Hunkins et al. 1977) found more than enough work to report on in his review; and Chapin (1974) found that the most popular topic of social studies dissertations done from 1969 through March of 1973 was "teachers and teacher education." Interest in inservice education has risen especially significantly since 1967; only one study was identified as dealing explicitly with inservice education in the pre-1967 comprehensive reviews. (There are some hints, although no research on the hypothesis, that the "new social studies" movement may have contributed largely to the upsurge in interest in teacher education, particularly inservice education. Certainly, federal funding for inservice education must have contributed to increases in research in this area.) A dominant theme in the studies on teacher preparation during the sixties was the poor subject-matter preparation of social studies teachers. By the late sixties, however, some researchers were questioning whether subject-matter preparation was an important variable in teaching effectiveness. They found that there was no correlation between formal subject-matter preparation and teacher knowledge of the subject or between formal subject-matter preparation and student cognitive learning. Another major theme of the teacher education research concerned the effects of special teacher training programs. Generally, studies in this area have found that training programs do change teacher behaviors, but there is some question as to whether the changed behaviors in turn have any effects on student outcomes.

Many of the reviewers noted that very little research had been done on methods of evaluation in the social studies.

Research Methodology

A rather hefty percentage--probably well over half--of the studies reported in the comprehensive reviews of social studies educational research have been "status" (census-like) studies. These most commonly include surveys of such things as practices, teacher and student characteristics (attitudes, knowledge, socioeconomic status, abilities, and the like), and curriculum objectives and content; descriptions of classroom programs and practices and teacher education programs and practices; and comparative analyses of curriculum materials following various sets of criteris. (Status research is not reported in this section.

Instead, status studies were used in the preceding section, on the state of practices in social studies.)

A relatively small percentage of studies reported--though a percentage that appears to have grown substantially in recent years--attempted to explore relationships among variables. Most of these "scientific" studies examine relationships between classroom teaching methods, materials, and content, on the one hand, and student outcomes--primarily cognitive--on the other. Some surveys have also explored relationships among variables through statistical manipulation of data gathered at a single point in time.

Only a very few studies have employed observational techniques in an attempt to examine teacher and student behavior directly. There has been more attention to observed behavior recently, however.

Also recently, there has been increased attention to interactions among complex sets of variables, perhaps because of the growing sophistication of statistical techniques for dealing with such complex data. However, behavioral observation and attention to interactions cannot be said, by any means, to be dominant in current social studies research.

The three dissertation compilations provide an indication of changing preferences for various research methodologies in social studies research. Gross and De La Cruz (1971) compared the methodologies employed in the dissertations listed by McPhie and those they listed:

Table 37

Methodologies Used in Dissertations, 1934-1969

Methodology	McPhie (1934-1962)	Gross & De La Cruz (1963-1969)
Analytic	30%	35%
Developmental and Conceptual	20%	20%
Experimental	20%	10%
Survey	20%	15%
Evaluative and Historical	10%	20%
Total Number of Studies	566	216

Gross and De La Cruz noted that a major change was an increase in the percentage of evaluative studies. Also, they found it disturbing that the percentage of experimental studies had decreased. They suggested that this might be partially attributed to the increased research activity in development centers, school districts, and professional organizations, which might be drawing research talent away from schools of education.

Chapin (1974) used a somewhat different classification system to categorize the methodologies employed in dissertations produced from 1969 through March 1973:

Table 38

Methodologies Used in Dissertations, 1969-1973

Methodology	Chapin (1969-1973)
Experimental	36%
Descriptive, Field	19%
Questionnaire	15%
Content Analysis	10%
Curriculum Development	8%
Historical	6%
Models, Theory	3%
Interviews	3%
Total Number of Studies	417

Assuming Chapin's **definition** of experimental was similar to that used by Gross and De La Cruz, the trend toward decreasing experimental studies had definitely been reversed, with 154 of the 417 dissertations employing experimental methods.

Grade Level Distribution

A rough count of the numbers of studies focusing on various grade levels, as reported in the comprehensive reviews, revealed that attention to elementary and to high school has been approximately equal over the last two decades. This finding tends to call into question the oft-heard complaint that the social studies profession does not pay very much attention to the problems of elementary teachers. However, Chapin's tally of grade levels for dissertations from 1969 through March 1973 supports the complaint. She noted a relative neglect of research at the elementary level among doctoral candidates:

Table 39

Grade Levels of Dissertations, 1969-1973

Grade Level	Percentage of Dissertations, 1969-1973
Elementary (K-6)	22%
Junior High	8%
K-8	1%
Senior High	38%
Junior and Senior High	1%
K-12	3%
Higher Education, Teachers	23%
Not stated, not relevant	4%

Dunfee (1970), in her very thorough review of elementary social studies research, pointed out there there was almost no research on elementary social studies before 1960.

The two levels that definitely receive short shrift from researchers, as reflected both in the rough count of comprehensive review citations and in the Chapin tally, are junior high and preschool.

Miscellany

Chapin (1974) noted a changing pattern of institutions producing social studies doctorates from 1963 to 1973. There appeared to be a marked trend toward decentralization. She wondered if this might not cause problems of quality control and of adequate dissemination of dissertation findings.

Chapin also noted that a whopping 81 percent of social studies doctoral candidates from 1969 to 1973 were male. It was not possible for her to determine minority group membership of candidates.

A typical comment made by reviewers is, "Teachers have been encouraged to use Method X (or Materials Y or Equipment Z) before there has been sufficient research to show how and in what ways the method (materials, equipment) aid the learning process." Such comments have merit from the point of view of rational decision making. Perhaps researchers and reviewers are right to bemoan the tendency of advocates to push their products before "the data are in." On the other hand, from a practical standpoint, one wonders if any innovation would ever occur were we to wait for research results. Or, would any substantial and sustained research get done at all without the presence of popular interest to stimulate provision of funds over a period long enough and on an adequate scale to support the accomplishment of a "sufficient" amount of research (whatever that is).

Findings of Social Studies Research

The specific findings derived from the reviews of research will be presented as appropriate under particular headings in the subsections that follow.

Summary Observations

1) Research in social studies/social science education did not really blossom until the early 1960's. Since about 1960 there appears to have been a more or less steady increase each year in the amount of research done in the field.

2) Many of the reviewers of research have appeared hesitant to comment upon and interpret research in the field. Needless to say, this makes it difficult to summarize the results, to date, of all these efforts.

3) Many reviewers have expressed concern over the lack of a cumulative research base in social studies/social science education

4) It should not be surprsing to learn that content (subject matter)--usually as a status variable but sometimes as an independent variable--has been one of the major foci of inquiry in this field. Neither should it be surprising that geography, U.S. history, and world history have been by far the most studied, with civics/government and economics trailing at some distance. Behavioral science (anthropology, sociology, and psychology) subject matter has received very little attention. (Most of the studies of content are dealt with in Section 1.0, since they use subject matter as a status variable.)

5) Rivaling content variables as a focus of research have been instructional techniques and methods.

6) Another very popular focus of research has been the analysis of textbook content. (These studies are reviewed in subsection 1.4, since they are classified as status studies.)

7) There has been less of a focus on learner variables (such as cognitive and affective development, learning styles, motivation) than on the above areas as independent variables. As one might expect, learner variables have been usually looked at as outcomes and, for the most part, the emphasis has been on cognition, although recently there has been increased interest in the affective domain.

8) Teacher education appears to have been of little interest to researchers in social studies/social science education until the latter part of the sixties. There has been a noticeable increase in the number of studies focusing on inservice education in the early seventies.

9) A large proportion of research in the field has been in the nature of "status" studies; that is, census-like surveys of the state of curriculum offerings, instructional practices, teacher and student characteristics, and the like, with little or no attempt to discover relationships among such status variables. A small but increasing percentage of the research consists of studies employing "scientific" designs--that is, studies examining relationships among variables. (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 392) The bulk of these explore relationships between classroom teaching strategies, techniques, and materials, on the one hand, and student outcomes, primarily cognitive, on the other.

10) The number of studies focusing on the elementary level and the number focusing on the high school level appear to be approximately even. The junior high level and preschool level have, by contrast, been neglected.

11) Although we have not presented specific data in this report to support the contention, it appears that the amount of research activity in social studies has been considerably lower than in other major sectors of the precollege curriculum.

2.3 Research on Effectiveness of Different Kinds of Content in Social Studies/Social Science Education

This brief subsection notes the lack of research on the relative merits of using various kinds of content for achieving the goals of the social studies.

Sources

All the reviews mentioned in subsection 2.2 were examined for possible clues in regard to content effectiveness research.

Documentation and Discussion

The "nature of the discipline" has long been a hotly debated issue among social studies professionals. Barth and Shermis (1970) suggested that there were three major schools of thought about the purposes and content of the social studies:

1) social studies as citizenship transmission;
2) social studies as social science; and
3) social studies as reflective inquiry.

More recently, Brubaker, Simon, and Williams (1977) offered a somewhat different breakdown of the contending approaches:

1) social studies as knowledge of the past as a guide to good citizenship;
2) social studies as reflective inquiry;
3) social studies in the student-centered tradition;
4) social studies as structure of the disciplines; and
5) social studies as sociopolitical involvement.

Research is not likely to provide a resolution to these disagreements about the nature of the field, since the issue is largely one involving differences in values and goals. However, it has been suggested that there are some areas in which sound empirical research could lend some clarification to the debate. For instance, Shaver (1973), defining social studies as citizenship education, suggested that research should examine "whether and how social science courses contribute to the oft-stated goals of citizenship education . . ." (p. 1245). Within the framework of a given set of goals for social studies, researchers could illuminate instrumental questions about what content and how much of it contributes most to the achievement of those goals.

Unfortunately, there appears to be virtually no research comparing the merits of one type of content with another for achieving specified sets of social studies goals and objectives. Skretting and Sundeen (1969) noted that research had not given an answer to the question of which type of content--concepts, generalizations, and methodologies associated with the social sciences or content associated with public-issues approaches such as that advocated by Shaver--was the most appropriate and effective in the cognitive domain. Shaver (1973) commented on the "lamentable lack of research" in this area, one in which "research is badly needed so that much of the current rhetoric based on supposition can be replaced by discourse based on evidence" (p. 1245).

Research reviews seem to be of the opinion that little or no empirical research has been done on social studies content questions, except, of course, for status studies, such as surveys of the content actually being taught in schools, of which there are many. However, it would appear that at least one possible source of relevant findings is available but has not been collated and interpreted. Many of the research and evaluation studies on the "new social studies" materials compared outcomes for students who had been taught with materials focusing on one kind of content (usually social science) with outcomes for students who had been taught with materials focusing on another kind of content (usually chronological history or institutional civics content). (See Wiley and Superka 1977 for a listing of these studies.) This source of information, comparing the merits of various kinds of content in achieving various kinds of social studies objectives, is largely untapped. As a result, no generalizations about the effects of content variables on outcomes can be made here.

Summary Observations

1) According to reviews of research in the social studies, little or no empirical research has focused on questions about the relative merits of different kinds of content (e.g., social science, public issues, chronological history) in achieving the goals of the social studies. The reviews have not identified, much less interpreted, any research in this area.

2) One body of studies that appears to contain findings relevant to questions about the comparative effects of different kinds of content is that evaluating the effectiveness of various "new social studies" materials in comparison to other materials. Often differences in content were major variables in these studies. However, no one has examined these studies as a group and interpreted their results as they relate to the question of content effects.

2.4 Research on Effectiveness and Efficiency of Social Studies/Social Science Instructional Methods and Techniques

This subsection reviews research on instructional methods in the social studies. Much of this research has examined what is variously called "critical thinking," "inquiry," "problem solving," and the like. The findings of and problems with this body of research are discussed. Then we take a look at research on more discretely defined, less global instructional techniques, such as procedures for teaching facts, procedures for teaching concepts, mastery learning, games and simulations, and the lecture method.

Sources

The materials for this subsection was drawn from commentary provided in both the comprehensive and the special-focus reviews of research in the social studies. In addition, some information has been drawn from selected special-focus reviews outside the social studies.

Five comprehensive reviews contained comments and information that have been incorporated here:

Hunkins et al. 1977 (chapters by Mortorella, Ehman, and Tucker)
Johnson, Payette, and Cox 1969
Massialas and Smith 1965
Payette, Cox, and Johnson 1970
Skretting and Sundeen 1969

The largest single cluster of special-focus reviews in social studies focused on critical thinking research. These include:

Feely 1976
Fersh 1955 (chapter by Gross)
Gross and MacDonald 1958
Hawkins and Templeton 1972
Marsh 1974
Metcalf 1963
ice 1974
Shaver 1962

Barnes and Clawson 1975

Hartley and Davies 1976

Finally, one review, also covering a broader range than social studies subject matter, examined research comparing lecture and discussion methods:

Stovall 1958

Documentation and Discussion

This area of social studies/social science educational research appears to be fairly chaotic, at least from the perspective of extant reviews, both comprehensive and special focus. Although a large portion of social studies research falls under this heading, this research appears to have yielded few conclusions that one can endorse with much confidence and few guidelines for practitioners. The picture is not entirely bleak, since some order is beginning to take shape in a few well-defined areas. These--as well as some still confused areas--will be noted in the discussion of discrete techniques below. First, however, we shall examine the research on more general instructional approaches in the social studies.

General Instructional Approaches: Critical Thinking

From reading reviews of research, one gets the impression that there are really only two alternatives in the way of general, or comprehensive, approaches to social studies instruction: "critical thinking" (sometimes called by other names) and "traditional."

So-called traditional approaches include a host of "sins." Precise definitions of traditional teaching are hard to come by, although it is usually implied that such teaching consists primarily of repeated cycles of lecture, reading, recitation, and testing, or some variation thereon. There is little, if any, research on traditional teaching itself--or at least no research that

Shaver and Larkins 1973

Templeton and Hawkins 1972

In addition to the above reviews, which centered primarily on social studies, one other, which looked at "discovery learning" in a broader perspective, was utilized:

Hermann 1969

A number of special-focus reviews examined particular instructional techniques. Five of these looked at research on simulations and games:

Bagley 1974

Chapman et al. 1974

Cherryholmes 1966

Fletcher 1971

Wentworth and Lewis 1973

All but the Fletcher review focused specifically on simulation/gaming in the social studies.

One review examined research on teaching reading in the social studies:

Lunstrum and Taylor 1977

Two reviews summarized research on mastery learning, the first being a review of mastery learning in all subjects and the second focusing specifically on social studies:

Block 1974

Rice 1976

Two other reviews examined research on values education techniques:

Kirschenbaum 1975

Raths, Harmin, and Simon 1966

Two reviews, covering a broader scope than just social studies, summarized research on pre-instructional strategies such as advance organizers and behavioral objectives:

we could find. Instead, traditional instruction seems to be whatever the comparison group is doing in contrast to the experimental group. (This second-fiddle role may account partially for the lack of a very clear conception of "traditional" teaching in social studies.)

What the experimental group is doing in most social studies research on general approaches is usually labeled "critical thinking" or some variation thereof. There has been much more attention to definition within the "critical thinking" cluster than within the "traditional" cluster. The various labels that have been used--critical thinking, reflective thinking, inquiry, higher-level cognitive learning, and problem solving--indicate a variety of attempts to clarify exactly what this cluster of general approaches consists of. However, the profession has not arrived at any consensus; in fact, one of the major problems with research in this area, according to reviewers, has been a lack of clarity about what these various labels mean in operational terms. We have grouped these possibly distinct clusters into one category here primarily because most social studies educators seem still to think of them as either the same thing or related things. They all appear to share the aim of moving students toward the fullest development of human reasoning capacities. In this report, we shall usually refer to this area as critical thinking, simply to avoid having to repeat all the labels at every mention.

Over the period covered by this report--indeed, since at least the Progressive Education Movement--there has been a sustained interest among social studies educators in the area of critical thinking. Several special-focus reviews and almost all the comprehensive reviews have singled out critical thinking for some special attention. (Also, there have been a number of reviews of research on critical thinking outside the social studies) Some social studies reviewers have claimed that there have been very few experimental studies focusing on critical thinking, in spite of widespread lip-service to critical thinking objectives in the social studies (Skretting and Sundeen 1969; Shaver 1962; Metcalf 1963; Marsh 1974; Gross in Fersh 1955). A perusal of titles in the bibliographies of reviews, however, uncovers a rather large number of studies making reference to the area in their titles. It may be that the reviewers who claim a dearth of research in this area have developed sufficiently precise conceptions to narrow the number of studies they consider relevant; however, this precision is not always made explicit.

Overall Results. Almost unanimously the social studies reviewers who attend to critical thinking complain that the results of research in the area have been disappointing, at best. They say that the studies that have been conducted show no consistent, significant results favoring critical thinking treatments (Johnson, Payette, and Cox 1969; Payette, Cox, and Johnson 1970; Shaver 1962; Metcalf 1963; Marsh 1974; Rice 1974). Marsh's summary of "inquiry" studies (1974) is particularly illuminating in this regard, both because of its relative recency and because of his straightforward presentation of the data. Marsh found a total of 28 experimental studies conducted between 1967 and 1972 dealing with inquiry in the social studies. He classified these studies as follows (p. 37):

Table 40

RESULTS OF EXPERIMENTS COMPARING INQUIRY TEACHING METHODS IN SOCIAL STUDIES WITH OTHER METHODS (1967-72)

Dependent Variable	Significant for Inquiry Method	Not Significant for Inquiry Method	Favorable Results for Inquiry Method but not Statistically Significant
Recall	3	2	2
Transfer	2		
Retention	1		
Specific Inquiry Variable (e.g., Questioning Skills	3	1	6
Inquiry Related Variable (e.g., Public Interest)	2	2	4
Total	11	5	12

He then proceeded to critique those studies that showed significant results favoring inquiry, in which he found deficiencies in sampling and other conditions. This eliminated all 11 studies favoring inquiry. In addition, he found major deficiencies in the remaining studies, such as brevity of treatment and failure to provide details about teaching procedures. In the end, one is left without evidence to confirm _or_ refute claims for inquiry.

Specific Findings. While recognizing the myriad weaknesses in studies on critical thinking instruction, a number of reviewers have attempted to tease out some specific findings and indicate some general tendencies suggested by the body of research. These "findings" are listed below:

1. _Learning of facts_: Studies consistently show critical thinking treatments produce as much factual learning as do comparison treatments, even though they do not consistently show any superiority for critical thinking treatments in this respect. On standardized tests, as well as other measures of fact learning, students taught by critical thinking methods do as well as students taught by other methods. (Cox and Cousins in Massialas and Smith 1965; Tucker, in Hunkins et al. 1977; Rice 1974; Templeton and Hawkins 1972)

2. _Learning higher-level cognitive skills_: At least some studies show that critical thinking methods _can_ produce outcomes such as "independent thinking," although such outcomes do not occur consistently in all studies. (Templeton and Hawkins 1972)

3. _Guidance versus no guidance_: Explicit teaching of inquiry skills rather than pure discovery or incidental learning produces greater proficiency in those skills (Cox and Cousins in Massialas and Smith 1965). At least some guidance is beneficial, but its absence delays rather than prevents solutions to problems (Gross and MacDonald 1958).

4. Kinds of guidance: The effectiveness of guidance does not depend solely on the amount of information imparted. Providing a method rather than a principle may be more helpful for less able students in problem-solving instruction. (Gross and MacDonald 1958)

5. Attitude change: Inquiry approaches appear to create favorable student attitudes toward social studies (Tucker, in Hunkins et al. 1977). Other attitudinal effects may also be significant benefits of critical thinking approaches as contrasted with other approaches (Martorella, in Hunkins et al. 1977; Hawkins and Templeton 1972).

6. Efficiency: Searching modes of instruction take more time to cover a given amount of content than do reception modes (Rice 1974; Hawkins and Templeton 1972).

7. Kinds of content: The realism of the problem makes no difference to the quality of solution developed (Gross and MacDonald 1958).

8. Grade levels: Inquiry methods can produce increments in learning at the elementary level as well as at the secondary level (Templeton and Hawkins 1972).

9. Student ability levels: Contrary to received opinion, disadvantaged, low-ability youngsters can learn from open-ended strategies (Hawkins and Templeton 1972).

10. Individual differences: Students' mental sets, such as rigidity and dogmatism, and anxiety may affect abilities to benefit from inquiry approaches. Research suggests a number of specific means for reducing set and anxiety. (Cox and Cousins in Massialas and Smith 1965; Gross and MacDonald 1958)

If these few scattered findings, which are tentative suggestions at best (except for the first), are all that social studies researchers can tell us about teaching critical thinking, then research is indeed in a pitiful state. However, at least a couple of writers give us some reason to question whether research on critical thinking has been so fruitless. First, Feely (1976) notes that research efforts that have broken down the notion of critical thinking into somewhat discrete tasks, following what he calls the "logical paradigm" instead of the "mental paradigm," have produced fairly clear results in some areas. Second, Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) discusses two cognitive areas--ones that are important elements of critical thinking--in which research has yielded specific, clear guidelines for instructional practice. These are factual learning and conceptual learning. (Martorella's conclusions are described below in the discrete techniques section.) Like Feely, Martorella has found that research that focuses on discrete tasks has produced illuminating results. It should be noted that neither Feely nor Martorella limited his search to studies within the social studies, while the reviewers who have come up with discouraging conslusions have generally looked only or primarily at social studies research. (This is not meant to imply that social studies research is barren while researchers in other fields have been productive. Rather, the implication is that social studies research needs to be compiled and interpreted together with research from other areas.)

It may be useful at this point to examine briefly findings in regard to inquiry methods that have been culled from the more general educational research, done mostly by learning psychologists. Hermann (1969) examined "learning by discovery" experiments and, while cautioning the reader about deficiencies in the research, listed the following findings as ones that could be stated with at least some degree of confidence:

1) Better retention results from ruleg (rule-example) learning than from egrule (example rule or inductive) learning.
2) Better transfer results from discovery learning.
3) As the difficulty of the transfer task increases, discovery becomes relatively more effective.
4) As the time between learning and testing on the transfer task increases, discovery is relatively more effective.

5) When the learning task involves material such as that taught in schools, discovery is relatively more effective.

6) Discovery learning may be more effective when student background knowledge in the subject being taught is limited.

7) Discovery methods are relatively more effective for low-ability than for high ability groups.

8) Immediate verbalization or further learning after material has been learned through discovery adversely affects the original learning.

9) A "reasonable degree" of guidance is better than little guidance in discovery learning.

10) Discovery learning takes more time than reception learning and better results could in some cases be attributed to this.

Problems with Critical Thinking Research. Reviewers have suggested there are three major problems blocking progress in critical thinking research: (1) failure to consider critical thinking instruction in a comprehensive theoretical perspective; (2) failure to control treatment variables sufficiently; and (3) failure to use adequate, appropriate dependent measures.

Metcalf (1963) and Shaver and Larkins (1973) both argue that instructional research in social studies pays scant attention to theory. This, of course, leads to a lack of clarity about exactly what is being studied or what ought to be studied. The atheoretical, or even antitheoretical, mentality that seems to pervade the field has produced a fragmented, "shotgun" orientation, in which critics can legitimately claim that "research doesn't tell us a damn thing."

If research were more clearly theory based, one of the benefits would probably be more careful control of independent variables. The second major criticism of critical thinking research has been that it generally fails to control treatment variables. Metcalf, arguing for testing of a particular theory of reflective thinking based on the ideas of Dewey and Griffin and following a Hempeliam model of deduction, suggested that

> Statements that assign more importance to teacher personality and variety of technique than to any other factors will probably be made until research on technique brings under control variables as basic as the amount and quality of reflection taking place in the classroom. (Metcalf 1963, p. 156)

Payette, Cox, and Johnson (1970) noted that researchers who worked with gross variables, rather than analyzing critical thinking into its component parts, produced very confusing and mixed results. Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) also concluded that research on the cognitive effects of "nonexpository methods of instruction" defied summarization, for, although the labels given to treatments in these studies were similar (for instance, "inquiry" versus "traditional" methods), it was not at all clear that the experimental treatments themselves were comparable or that experimental and comparison treatments differed from each other significantly. Shaver and Larkins (1973) pointed out that researchers frequently fail to verify that "the independent variable of teacher behavior did indeed occur as assumed" (p. 1249). Marsh (1974), too, argued for greater clarification of the "omnibus" term, inquiry, for research purposes. Finally, Feely (1976) argued that the "logical paradigm," which breaks critical thinking down into component operations, would be much more fruitful than the "mental paradigm," which views critical thinking as something like a mysterious black box.

A third major problem in critical thinking research in the social studies concerns measures of the dependent variables. Shaver and Larkins (19/3) noted that the "achievement of objectives sought in social studies instruction is typically difficult to measure . . ." (p. 1250).

> One reaction to the difficulty of measuring commonly espoused social studies objectives has been a regressive tendency for researchers to fall back on that which is easily measurable--knowledge--ignoring attitudes, values and thought processes. Consequently, much of what is measured in research on teaching social studies is not relevant to many of the common objectives of the curriculum area. (p. 1250)

They suggest that this problem, too, results from lack of a clear theory of critical thinking: "Lacking a well-explicated conception of critical thinking, researchers too often make their judgments of test validity by default, simply accepting a test because it is published and available" (p. 1250).

In addition to the three major problem areas cited by reviewers of critical thinking research, a fourth problem might be mentioned. As noted previously, those reviewers who have detected some progress in critical thinking research have generally looked both at social studies research and research done outside the social studies. It would seem that insularity has contributed at least a small amount to the bleak impression of the state of our knowledge in this area.

Discrete Techniques

Both comprehensive and special-focus reviewers drew some conclusions about various discrete techniques that have been studied by researchers. The discrete techniques on which reviewers commented are the following: factual teaching, conceptual teaching, mastery learning, questioning, behavioral objectives, advance organizers, lecture and discussion, reading, self-pacing and student autonomy, simulations and games, values education techniques, and classroom climate.

Factual Teaching. Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) described a "well-established model for factual learning" that had been confirmed through research. Teaching facts involves moving a student through the following steps:

1) attending to stimuli;
2) discriminating the stimulus to be learned;
3) practicing the material;
4) actual learning experiences; and
5) overlearning.

In the process, mediators are introduced to help organize the materials; periodic reinforcement is administered; and feedback is given.

Concept Teaching. Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) also described a skeletal model for concept learning that has been confirmed by research. It includes the following components:

1) assessing the concept rule and criterial attributes preceding instruction;
2) introducing students to a number of examples and nonexamples selected on the basis if the preassessment;
3) helping students to attend to the relevant dimensions of the concept;
4) stating a definition of the concept in terms meaningful to the students;
5) providing students with some strategy for distinguishing examples and nonexamples as well as criterial and noncriterial attributes of the concept;
6) teaching criterial attributes to students at some point, unless they already know them;
7) providing opportunity to experiment or practice with cases; and
8) providing feedback on correctness of responses.

Different levels of mastery of a concept are possible. For young children, visual stimuli rather than verbal should be used whenever possible.

Martorella notes, by the way, that, while the cumulative research on factual and conceptual learning is at a relatively advanced stage, there has been little systematic application of these findings in the construction of curriculum materials.

Mastery Learning. Mastery learning has received much attention in the general educational research literature in recent years. Block (1974) reviewed research on mastery learning in the classroom and offered the following generalizations:

1) Mastery learning can yield substantially greater student achievement in certain subjects than lecture-recitation or lecture-discussion.

2) There is reason to believe that future studies will show mastery learning yields greater retention than nonmastery approaches.

3) There are hints in the research that mastery approaches yield greater transfer of training than nonmastery approaches.

4) In the short run at least, mastery approaches have noticeable effects on student interest and attitudes. High levels of interest in and positive attitudes toward topics studied occur with mastery approaches. Mastery learning generates students' confidence in their ability to learn. Also, over the short run, students enjoy mastery approaches.

5) Mastery treatments yield less variability in student achievement than nonmastery treatments and may reduce individual differences in learning rates.

It should be noted that, in the first generalization, Block limits his conclusion to "certain subjects" (which he does not specify). It appears that social studies is one of the more difficult areas in which to apply mastery learning approaches. A cluster of studies done recently at the University of Georgia demonstrated no support for mastery learning's cognitive effects in the social studies. The mastery learning materials and procedures used in these studies did not overcome initial differences in aptitude among students. (Rice 1976; Martorella, in Hunkins et al. 1977)

Questioning. There has been a fairly dramatic increase in research on classroom questioning in the last ten years. Although several of the more recent comprehensive reviews described questioning studies, Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) was the only reviewer to provide a summary of results. He claimed that this body of research had not yielded clear, practical guidelines as yet. Most of the studies have dealt with the effects of different levels of questions rather than questioning patterns or sequences. The results on levels are quite checkered. Martorella recommended concentrating future attention on patterns rather than levels.

Behavioral Objectives. According to Skretting and Sundeen in 1969, there had been little research on social studies objectives (other than surveys of what people thought social studies objectives should be and were). By 1977, Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) was able to devote several paragraphs to a discussion of research on behavioral objectives in the social studies. Martorella referred readers to Hartley and Davies (1976) for a more detailed review of behavioral objectives research. The Hartley and Davies review examined studies from all areas, not just social studies; however, they noted that subject area did not seem to make a difference. Their conclusions included:

1) Behavioral objectives work best when they are salient to the task.
2) Disclosing behavioral objectives works better prior to traditional types of teaching than to nontraditional.
3) Closely structured materials tend to make behavioral objectives superfluous.
4) Behavioral objectives are not useful in learning tasks calling for knowledge and comprehension.
5) Behavioral objectives are more useful in higher-level tasks of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.
6) Behavioral objectives reduce the need for reasoning on certain tasks.
7) Behavioral objectives sometimes interfere in problem-solving tasks.
8) Students of middle ability profit more from behavioral objectives than do students of low or high ability.
9) Disclosing behavioral objectives reduces student anxiety.
10) Behavioral objectives are less effective with submissive, self-controlled, considerate, and conscientious students.
11) The effects of behavioral objectives on learning are not clearcut, but in those cases where a significant effect has been found, it has almost always been in favor of behavioral objectives.

12) Length of instruction, level of education, and type of subject do not appear to make a difference in the effectiveness of behavioral objectives.

Advance Organizers. Advance organizers are another device that has received much attention only recently in social studies research. Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) and Hartley and Davies (1976) both describe results in this area as "confused," at best. Barnes and Clawson (1975) reviewed 32 studies done between 1960 and 1974 on advance organizers. These studies used both social studies and other subject matter. Their major points were the following:

1) Twelve of the 32 studies reported significant results favoring advance organizers and 20 reported nonsignificant effects.
2) Length of treatment was not a factor facilitating effects.
3) There were no trends indicating advance organizers have differential effects on students of low, middle, and high abilities.
4) There were no consistent differential effects by subject matter (social studies, math, and science).
5) There were no apparent grade-level effects.
6) The studies do not support the use of written organizers; there are too few studies on other kinds (such as visual organizers or games) to warrant any conclusions.
7) No generalizations can be made about effects of advance organizers on tasks of different cognitive levels.
8) In sum, "the efficacy of advance organizers has not been established" (p. 651). Barnes and Clawson do, however, recommend a plan for future research in the area.

Lecture and Discussion. The relative merits of lecture versus discussion have not been of very great interest recently; however, Stovall summarized research findings on this issue in 1958. Stovall's review was not limited to social studies research. He enumerated the following generalizations:

1) Objective tests of recall or recognition of factual information show lecture and discussion methods to be approximately equal in most cases, although some experimenters have reported results favoring lecture.
2) Only a few studies have looked at the effects of lecture versus discussion on retention of information. One series found retention significantly better for discussion classes than for reading and lecture classes without discussion.
3) Discussion is significantly superior to lecture in promoting ability to evaluate, synthesize, draw inferences, perceive relationships, and make applications of material learned.
4) Lectures can change expressed attitudes; however, the preponderance of evidence from varied sources indicates that group discussion is distinctly superior to lecture in changing attitudes and behavior.
5) Listening to lectures is mainly an individualistic activity. "By contrast, good group discussion is an aid to the development of the kind of relationships among students and between teacher and students which research has revealed to be necessary for highest levels of achievement." (p. 256)
6) Research has raised serious doubts about the quality of discussion possible in groups larger than 12.

Stovall adds a final caution, lest educators become too enamored with discussion:

> It should be apparent that profitable developmental discussion cannot be carried on unless those participating have some knowledge of pertinent facts, and research has shown the lecture, as well as reading, to be an effective means of providing this basic information efficiently. (p. 257)

Reading. Off and on over the last 20 years, the relationship between reading and social studies achievement has cropped up as a research interest. Currently, with the pressure of the back-to-basics movement, teaching reading in the social studies has become a much-talked-about topic among social studies practitioners. It is likely that we shall see another outcropping of research studies in this area quite soon. In 1960, Gross and Badger commented that another reviewer had summarized research on reading in the social studies in 1941 and that experimentation since that time revealed little that was "startlingly different." Poor reading ability was a major cause of failure in social studies and social studies teachers had few skills in teaching reading. Lunstrum and Taylor (1977) have reinforced this conclusion recently. They describe a number of practical techniques, supported by research (done primarily by reading specialists, not social studies educators), for teachers to use in improving reading skills while teaching social studies content. Ehman (in Hunkins et al. 1977) noted that there was some evidence that values-clarification techniques can enhance reading comprehension. (See below for discussion of values education techniques.)

Self-pacing and Student Autonomy. Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) reported briefly on three studies dealing with student self-pacing and autonomy. All three came to essentially similar conclusions: such practices produce no significant cognitive differences. No findings related to affective outcomes of student self-pacing and autonomy were reported in the comprehensive or special-focus reviews.

Simulations and Games. There has been tremendous practical and research interest in social studies simulations and games during the last decade. While Cherryholmes (1966) found only six studies in the area, more recent reviewers have found around 50. Although only one comprehensive reviewer singled out this area for comment, five special-focus reviews have been devoted to the topic.

Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) noted that, unlike mastery learning, simulations and games lend themselves easily to social studies subject matter. The studies Martorella reviewed indicated that simulations and games appeared to be at least as effective as other instructional systems in terms of cognitive effects, although they have not proven to be consistently superior to other instructional systems in this respect. He suggested that the strongest benefits of simulations and games may lie in their attitudinal effects; however, he did not review the literature related to these effects.

Wentworth and Lewis (1973) examined 48 studies on simulations and games. They stated three conclusions that appear still to be the only conclusions that one can draw with any confidence from the research in this area:

1) Simulations and games "do not appear to have any clear advantage in teaching content to students"(p. 438).

2) Simulations and games "appear to have a positive influence on student attitudes"(p. 438).

3) Simulations and games "appear to be influential in encouraging students to become more actively involved in the learning process" (p. 438-39).

Bagley (1974), based on a review of ten studies, added one further conclusion:

4) "Of the many variables investigated, only sex and ability are consistently shown to be important game mediating influence" (p. 288).

Chapman et al. (1974), reviewing approximately 50 studies, were able to elaborate somewhat on the second conclusion presented above. They noted that

> the data suggest that games can increase sympathetic understanding about problem situations in which people find themselves--as represented by the roles in the game--but this effect may not be enduring. Also, games do not seem to improve a player's sense of control over the real world. The attitude change which results from simulation/gaming tends to be game-specific. (p. 21)

In regard to the first conclusion listed above, Chapman et al. pointed out that very few studies attempted to evaluate higher cognitive outcomes.

Wentworth and Lewis suggested several reasons for the lack of clearer findings from the research on simulations and games for the social studies. Most of the research employed inadequate testing procedures and research designs, used unsophisticated statistics, and did not distinguish important variables. [These complaints are becoming a familiar refrain.] Fletcher (1971) has voiced a criticism about the "shotgun" nature of research in this area. It has consisted mainly of single studies of particular games, each using different test batteries and measuring different independent and dependent variables.

Values Education. Beyond the question of students' liking of social studies, the early comprehensive reviewers generally paid little attention to affective outcomes of instruction. Apparently there were very few social studies research efforts that attempted to detect links between instructional methods and student values, attitudes, and beliefs before about 1970. This lack of attention was noted in two comprehensive reviews (Cox, Girault, and Metcalf 1966 and Girault and Cox 1967). The first noted that, although many of the studies done in 1965 attended in significant ways to value questions, the researchers approached these questions by means of examining the "official" treatment of values in textbooks and instruction rather than "grappling with the actual attitudes and values students themselves bring into and take away from the social studies classroom" (p. 126). In the 1967 review, the reviewers suggested that more research activity ought to be occurring in this area, in which social studies educators express so much concern and which is so central to social studies. They suggested that one difficulty might be the lack of appropriate measurement instruments. (Apparently some research on values instruction had been occurring in the early and mid-sixties, for in 1966 Raths, Harmin, and Simon were able to review 12 studies of values clarification treatments. This work appears not to have seeped into the awareness of social studies educators at the time of the aforementioned reviews.)

By the 1970s, values education was a "hot topic" in social studies. Superka et al. (1976) developed a classification system to help educators sort out the prodigious amounts of curriculum materials that were appearing. The six types of values education treatments identified in the Superka classification were: inculcation, moral development, value analysis, value clarification, action learning, and evocation and union.

Ehman (in Hunkins et al. 1977) reviewed research in three of these areas (clarification, analysis, and moral development). He noted that he was able to identify no research in the other three areas. The comments reported below are taken primarily from Ehman. Overall, Ehman noted that the research base in values education is still quite weak and that additional research is badly needed in view of the popularity, bordering on faddishness, of values education.

1) Values Clarification: Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) reviewed 12 studies testing the hypothesis that values clarification techniques would change non-value-based behavior to value-based (purposeful, consistent, and rational) behavior. These showed positive tendencies but were not entirely consistent. After 1966, apparently there was a lull in values clarification research; a second wave of research in the area developed in the early 1970s. Kirschenbaum (1975) reviewed 11 studies from this second wave, but did not attempt to draw any conclusions from them.

The date of the earliest study reviewed by Ehman was 1973. Ehman noted that all of the clarification studies done so far had focused on the upper-elementary and middle-school levels. There was some evidence that values clarification techniques could change self-concept and behavior at the upper-elementary level after several weeks' treatment. Also, there was good reason to believe that values clarification techniques could positively affect cognitive outcomes--specifically, reading comprehension. Ehman noted that a major drawback of the values clarification studies was that none employed a delayed posttest. Tucker (in Hunkins et al. 1977) also touched upon values clarification research, noting that invalid and unreliable measures of attitudinal and behavioral criteria have plagued this area.

2) Value Analysis: Ehman also examined value analysis techniques, but found that nothing could, as yet, be concluded about this area. The value analysis researchers needed to analyze these techniques into their component parts and experiment to find which parts are truly crucial to the success of such strategies.

3) Moral Development: Ehman expressed particular concern--echoed by Tucker--about the thin research base underpinning all the hoopla about moral development ("Kohlbergian") instruction. Ehman noted that there were only six published field studies, nearly all of which had been conducted by the developers of moral development curricula. These six studies appeared to yield two generalizations:

a) Specially designed curriculum programs in social studies that incorporate discussions of moral dilemmas over an extended time can possibly influence moral development of students in grades five through 12.

b) Some effects of these programs are not necessarily immediate; they may require considerable time to appear. (In contrast to the values clarification studies, these studies routinely used delayed posttests.)

Both Ehman and Tucker questioned the assertion of moral development advocates that the plus-one-stage theory has been confirmed. The plus-one-stage theory is the closest thing the moral development school has to a specific, practical instructional guideline. It asserts that a transition to a higher stage of moral reasoning will occur as a result of conflict and discomfort experienced in encountering real-life or hypothetical dilemmas and being exposed to one stage higher moral reasoning in these situations. This claim does not rest on a sound base of carefully designed field studies. All that the existing studies show is that heterogeneous-stage grouping (a mix of stages) can possibly be one factor in stimulating moral development.

Both Tucker and Ehman noted the need to explore whether classroom teachers can carry out tasks basic to the moral development approach. Some recent research has brought into question the assumption that teachers can be trained to handle such tasks.

4) Other Values Education Findings: An important admonition offered by Ehman and also found in the 1960 review by Gross and Badger is that studies have repeatedly confirmed that increased knowledge does not necessarily lead to growth in democratic attitudes and values.

Classroom Climate. Ehman noted that classroom climate has shown up in a number of studies as a significant variable in relation to attitude change. "Open" classroom climates may be particularly important in fostering democratic attitudes, but measures of classroom climate are inadequate at this point. Particularly needed for such instruments is construct validation and pinpointing of discrete operational factors. Until adequate instruments are employed, we can only regard the classroom climate research as suggestive.

Other Discrete Techniques. Research on techniques other than those mentioned above might have been considered for review here. However, other possible techniques were not singled out for interpretation and comment by comprehensive or special-focus reviewers in social studies. If we were to read and summarize the many individual research studies in these other areas here, it would take us far beyond the time limitations of this project. The techniques listed and discussed above are the only ones that have been singled out for comment in social studies reviews.

Summary Observations

1) A large proportion of the research conducted in social studies falls under the heading of research on instructional methods.

2) One gets the impression that there are only two varieties of "general instructional approaches" (as contrasted with "discrete techniques of instruction") of interest to social studies educators: "critical thinking" approaches (sometimes referred to as "reflective thinking," "inquiry," "higher-level cognitive learning," or "problem solving") and "traditional" instruction (whatever serves as a comparative treatment in studies of critical-thinking instruction).

3) Studies of "traditional" teaching per se are virtually nonexistent.

4) There has been sustained interest among social studies researchers in critical thinking over the two decades covered by this report (and prior to that time, as well).

5) Almost unanimously, the reviewers who have examined research results in critical thinking in the social studies have reported disappointment. The studies that have been conducted show no consistent, significant results favoring critical thinking. (However, these same studies show no significant results favoring comparison treatments, either.) Some reviewers have attempted to extract a few tentative generalizations suggested (though not confirmed) by the critical-thinking research.

6) Some reviewers have enumerated various weaknesses that may have contributed to the lack of fruitfulness in critical-thinking research: (a) failure to consider critical-thinking instruction in a comprehensive theoretical perspective; (b) failure to control treatment variables sufficiently; and (c) inadequate and inappropriate dependent measures. A fourth major problem--not cited by reviewers--is failure to integrate findings from social studies research with other research on critical thinking.

7) Much of the instructional research in social studies focuses on fairly narrowly limited techniques rather than comprehensive instructional approaches. The discrete techniques that reviewers have singled out for summarization of findings are: factual teaching, conceptual teaching, mastery learning, questioning, behavioral objectives, advance organizers, lecture and discussion, reading, self-pacing and student autonomy, simulations and games, values education techniques, and classroom climate. Although research has been conducted on many other discrete techniques in social studies, reviewers have not chosen to offer interpretations and summaries of such other clusters of research.

8) Research has confirmed models for factual and concept teaching; however, curriculum developers have not applied these well-established findings in the construction of materials in the social studies.

9) Research gives no support for use of mastery learning approaches in the social studies.

10) Results of research on questioning are unclear.

11) Research has produced some indications of circumstances in which behavioral objectives are and are not useful.

12) The efficacy of advance organizers has not been established by research.

13) Lecture methods may be considered at least as effective as discussion for information acquisition, but discussion is superior for increasing student

abilities in evaluation, synthesis, inference-making, perception of relationships, and application of material learned. Discussion is also superior for changing attitudes.

14) Student reading abilities are very closely related to achievement in social studies; however, social studies teachers do not avail themselves of many well-established techniques for helping their students with reading problems.

15) Research does not support the hypothesis that student self-pacing and autonomy improve cognitive learning.

16) Social studies simulations and games have been heavily researched. The major conclusions of this research are that simulations and games do not appear to have any advantage over other methods in teaching cognitive content; do appear to have positive effects on student attitudes; and do appear to encourage students to become more actively involved in the learning process.

17) Considering the high degree of enthusiasm over values education, rather little research has been conducted in this area--certainly not enough to support the claims of advocates of various values education approaches. There is some evidence that values clarification techniques may contribute to changing non-value-based behavior to consistent, purposeful, rational behavior, although this evidence is far from strong as yet. Nothing can yet be concluded from research on value analysis techniques. "Kohlbergian" techniques may possibly lead to development toward higher stages of moral reasoning; the effects may take some time to appear. There is some question as to whether teachers can be trained to produce the stage changes that experimenters have produced.

18) Increases in knowledge do not necessarily lead to growth in democratic attitudes and values.

19) Classroom climate may be a variable of major importance in attitude change.

2.5 Research on Effectiveness and Efficiency of Social Studies/Social Science Educational Materials

This subsection discusses the research that has been done on the effects of various kinds of curriculum materials in the social studies. There has not been a great deal of research activity in this area and what research has been done has not been compiled and interpreted so that any clear conclusions about materials effects can be passed on here.

Sources

Only four comprehensive reviews and one special-focus review included any commentary on research on the effectiveness of social studies curriculum materials. The four comprehensive reviews were:

Hunkins et al. 1977 (Ehman's chapter)
Skretting and Sundeen 1969
Johnson, Payette, and Cox 1969
Massialas and Smith 1965 (Palmer's chapter)

The one special-focus review was:

Lunstrum and Taylor 1977

Documentation and Discussion

There has apparently been relatively little research on the effectiveness of different types of curriculum materials, as distinct from other components of the instructional process such as teaching techniques and classroom climate.

Analyses of Materials. By far the bulk of materials research has instead consisted of analyses of characteristics of materials--for instance, analyses of biases against racial and ethnic groups, other nations, and the like. (This research is discussed in Section 1.0 of this report.) Ehman (in Hunkins et al. 1977), after reviewing a number of analyses of bias, noted that, in spite of all the concern about bias in materials, we do not have much evidence as to whether such biases have effects on student cognitive or affective growth and, if they do, in what directions. He had not located even a single study in the social studies literature on the effects of bias in materials. Recently, we ran across one such study (Rotzel and Tenenbaum 1974), which also noted the lack of social studies research in this area but pointed to an existing research base outside social studies on which social studies educators might build.

Programmed Materials. Two areas in which there does seem to have been a fair amount of research activity on social studies materials' effects are programmed materials and audiovisual materials. Both Skretting and Sundeen (1969) and Palmer (in Massialas and Smith 1965) commented on the remarkable growth in programmed materials in the sixties, but Palmer noted that the production and use of such materials in the social studies lagged far behind that in other subject areas. He pointed out that the research on programmed materials in general had focused on rather narrow teaching objectives, for which the materials seemed to "work," but it was not quite clear why they worked. Forms of knowledge other than information and association were not dealt with by such materials and the research on them. In the social studies itself, there had been relatively little research on programmed materials and the research that had been done was replete with findings of no significant differences. Skretting and Sundeen echoed Palmer's earlier observation in saying that it appeared that intuitive and reflective thinking, such as were being called for in the social studies in the late sixties, could not be easily handled in the programmed mode. Johnson, Payette, and Cox (1969), on the other hand, stated that six studies dealing with programmed instructional units in the social studies showed that students could learn social studies content by programmed methods.

Also, they noted that the six studies revealed that there were important interactions between programmed instruction and other educational variables. However, they did not specify what those other variables were.

Audiovisual Materials. Only one reviewer presented results of research on the effects of audiovisual materials in social studies (Palmer in Massialas and Smith 1965). Palmer stated that

> Motion pictures, television, filmstrips, and slides can teach arbitrary associations at least as effectively as conventional classroom techniques over a wide range of subject matter, age levels, abilities, and conditions of use. Retention appears to be at least as good as for conventional teaching. (p. 172)

Further, he noted that there is a little evidence that audiovisual materials can be used to teach critical thinking. In regard to attitudinal change, he found evidence that movies, television, and radio can influence attitudes under certain conditions; however, repeated exposure is probably required to prevent return to previous attitudes and change probably will not occur if messages are contrary to existing beliefs, personality structure, or social environment. According to Palmer, research on the use of audiovisual aids supports the following classroom practices: preparation of the class for the materials to be used; student participation during audiovisual lessons; and repeated exposure. Further, television and movies can completely take over the teaching role without reducing information gains. Finally, Palmer enumerated three "principles" related to audiovisual effectiveness: the ability to learn from visual materials develops with increased exposure; the predisposition of the learner toward the subject influences his acceptance or interpretation of it; and learning ability is not an important factor mediating results of audiovisual instruction.

"New Social Studies" Materials Evaluations. Another kind of social studies materials on which there has been a fair amount of research regarding effects is "new social studies" curriculum development project products. Most of this research consists of evaluations of materials produced by individual projects. The evaluations do not focus on the effects of the materials alone, however, but on the effects of the materials in conjuction with the insuructional methods recommended in them--the complete instructional systems of which the materials are a part. Wiley and Superka (1977) identified 192 evaluation reports on "new social studies" materials. (Although they included studies on materials not developed by curriculum projects, most of the studies focused on project-developed products.) Unfortunately, neither they nor anyone else attempted to summarize and interpret the findings from this cluster of research on materials' effects.

Reading Level. Lunstrum and Taylor (1977), among others, have noted that student reading abilities are a major factor in social studies acheivement. They have also noted that analyses of reading levels of textbooks have generally shown them to be too difficult for the abilities of most students with whom they are intended to be used. Mismatches between student reading abilities and materials' reading levels may contribute to poor cognitive outcomes in social studies.

Summary Observations

1) There has apparently been little research on the effectiveness of various types of curriculum materials, as distinct from other components of the instructional process, although there has been much research analyzing materials (see Section 1.0) and some research on the extent of use of various kinds of materials (see Section 4.0).

2) Two exceptions to the dearth of research on effectiveness are programmed materials and audiovisual materials. Reviewers have reported some studies in these areas.

3) There have been a number of studies evaluating the effectiveness of "new social studies" materials; however, no one has attempted to summarize and interpret the findings from these studies as a group.

4) There is some research hinting that the reading level of materials is an important factor in social studies learning.

2.6 Research on the Effects of Learner Variables in Social Studies/Social Science Education

The research literature on learner variables in the social studies appears to be a bit splotchy. The areas that reviewers have singled out for summary and interpretation, at any rate, do not fall into any obviously logical exhaustive set of categories. Certainly there has been much less concern among social studies researchers about learner variables than there has been about instructional methods. Five types of issues related to the effects of learner variables in social studies instruction have been examined by reviewers and are reported here: readiness and stages of development at the elementary level, class differences; cognitive styles; mental sets; and student interest in/liking for social studies. The research bases for all but the first are rather skimpy.

Sources

All the information on learner variables reported in this section came from eight comprehensive reviewers and one special-focus review. The eight comprehensive reviews were:

Harrison and Solomon 1964

Massialas and Smith 1965 (chapters by Smith, Penix, and Cox and Cousins)

Gross and Badger 1960

Skretting and Sundeen 1969

Johnson, Payette, and Cox 1969

Payette, Cox, and Johnson 1970

Cox and Johnson 1972

Hunkins et al. 1977 (chapters by Martorella, Ehman, and Tucker)

The special-focus review was:

Dunfee 1970

This special-focus review did not focus on learner variables per se; rather, its focus was on elementary social studies research, with one section on elementary learner variables. Thus, no one in social studies has as yet taken the area of learner variables as one meriting concentrated attention, review, and interpretation.

Documentation and Discussion

Elementary Student Variables: Readiness and Stages of Development. From the mid-sixties to the mid-seventies, there appears to have been a pendular swing in researcher's views on children's readiness to handle various types of social studies content. In the sixties, several reviewers asserted that research findings suggested that elementary students' interests, abilities, and knowledge were such that they could understand and work with "a great deal more social studies content than is presently expected or provided" (Harrison and Solomon 1964, p 197). A couple of reviewers cited studies than contradicted this conclusion (Skretting and Sundeen 1969 noted a study that indicated instruction in map and globe skills was introduced much earlier than approoriate and Johnson, Payette, and Cox 1969 found three studies demonstrating that elementary pupils experienced some difficulty in understanding certain geographical and cultural concepts.) However, most reviewers tended to agree with the thesis that many, if not all, children could handle certain time and chronology, space (map and globe), and social science concepts much earlier than previously thought.

Penix (in Massialas and Smith 1965), for instance, argued against "received wisdom." He noted that the accepted view in regard to children's abilities to deal with time and chronology had been that these abilities were closely related to maturation. Children supposedly had little or no sense of chronology before the sixth grade; hence, instruction in such concepts should be delayed until children had matured enough to handle them. Penix pointed out that these conclusions were based on studies that had been made 20 or more years before and that investigators in the sixties had begun to question them. He reviewed six studies that suggested there was considerable variation from one child to the next in the age at which ability to understand time concepts was developed and that planned instruction about time concepts reduced difficulties and increased understanding. These studies, according to Penix, strongly implied that the elementary curriculum should be revised to allow for flexibility rather than fixing the introduction of time concepts at particular grade levels. "There is no 'magic age' at which children acquire understanding of certain social studies concepts" (p. 85). Overall, the findings "question the basic assumption too often made in curriculum planning--that certain learnings must be reserved for certain grade levels" (p. 85).

Dunfee (1970), in one section of her very complete reporting of elementary social studies research, reflected essentially the same conclusions as Penix. She noted, in addition, a number of studies on children's map skills and space concepts, which also indicated there could be earlier introduction of this content than generally supposed. Also, Smith (in Massialas and Smith 1965) noted a number of experimental studies showing that primary-level pupils were able to understand basic social science concepts and that a conceptual approach to instruction was possible at the elementary level.

Although these reviewers did not mention Jerome Bruner's famous dictum that any child can be taught anything at any age, it appears that their conclusions and recommendations are quite well attuned to the spirit of the Burnerian view, which dominated much of educational thinking in the sixties. In contrast, during the seventies, we seem to be seeing a shift to a view more in tune with the prior position on readiness. Much attention is now being given to Piaget's theory of stages of intellectual development. Matching content with developmental stages appears to be a major concern.

Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977) presented a strong argument for greater attention to stages of intellectual development. He stated that many studies appeared to confirm that the development of thinking capacities follows a fixed sequence of stages and is the same across all subject matter. In addition, children's sensory modalities undergo developmental changes in fixed stages. According to Mortorella, what needs to be done to follow up this research on stages is to determine the differential effects of various instructional approaches that take the stages into account. He noted that very few curriculum materials produced to date have reflected an awareness of these stages. It would be especially important, at this point, to begin to analyze extensively how developmental research relates to curriculum scope and sequence.

This rather clear pendular swing in views regarding cognitive readiness is not so evident in the area of affective questions, although there are some fuzzy reflections of it. In the mid-sixties, it was urged that explicit instruction in citizenship attitudes begin earlier than was the general practice. Penix (in Massialas and Smith 1965) noted that the typical approach to teaching and reinforcing citizenship attitudes in the elementary grades was "informal," emphasizing national holidays and heroes, patriotic events, the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and attention to electoral processes during election years. Specific instruction in law and government was delayed until the junior and senior high years. However, Penix pointed out that some recent studies in political socialization indicated that citizenship attitudes were formed at quite an early age, much before junior high school. Accordingly, Penix recommended educatiors consider beginning formal instruction in these areas sooner.

In the seventies, the recommendation for earlier attention to value and attitude matters has not been rejected. If anything, social studies educators are becoming even more aware of the importance of this area in the child's early years. However, one element appearing in the shift of views in regard to children's cognitive abilities appears also in this realm. Kohlberg's theory of stages of moral development has received much attention in both research and practice in the early seventies. Both Ehman and Tucker (in Hunkins et al. 1977) devote considerable attention to research in this area. The research base in this area is much smaller than in the cognitive development area and has not yielded such clear results on stage-age connections.

Class Differences. Although there has been a great deal of debate over research outside of social studies on the effects of differences in socioeconomic status (SES), very little of this is reflected in the reviews of social studies research. Of course, a substantial proportion of social studies research studies more or less routinely have collected information on SES of subjects; however, very little is made of this information by reviewers.

In the 1960s, the SES question was phrased in terms of "cultural disadvantagement." According to Skretting and Sundeen (1969), concern about the problems of teaching the culturally disadvantaged became a major focal point during the 1960s. They reported that one important study found that, for high-ability students, SES appeared to have no effect on scholastic acheivement; but as intellectual ability decreased, SES factors exerted greater influence.

The matter of SES was again raised briefly by Johnson, Payette, and Cox in 1969. They pointed out that "socioeconomic variables exert more profound influences on student achievement than do the minipulation of classroom variables" (p. 71). The same reviewers, listed in a different order (Payette, Cox, and Johnson 1970), again noted the effects of SES factors the next year. They reported three studies that suggested "that life style of the home and other factors related to social status are at least as important as formal instruction in political and economic subjects" (p. 39). Cox and Johnson (1972) again commented on the importance of considering various kinds of student differences, including class differences, in designing instruction, but did not go into this in detail.

In all, from the reviewers, we know hardly anything about the relationships between social studies instruction, SES, and learning outcomes.

Cognitive Styles. Only one reviewer, Martorella (in Hunkins et al. 1977), spoke to the question of student cognitive styles. Martorella was particularly interested in studies that explored the interactions of cognitive style with objectives and instructional conditions. According to him, these studies have not produced conclusive results, although it is reasonable to surmise that cognitive style effects may differ across subject areas. Thus, many more studies of cognitive style in social studies appear desirable. Martorella recommends research in this area be aimed at giving directions about how to match students with appropriate instruction for given objectives.

Mental Sets. Cox and Cousins (in Massialas and Smith 1965) noted several studies that indicated that mental sets such as dogmatism and rigidity have adverse effects on learning processes, especially processes of an abstract nature requiring the entertainment of a number of alternatives or the creation of new hypotheses. One of these studies found support for using small, permissive groups involving low threat and intensive training skills for teaching dogmatic and rigid students.

Interest in and Liking for Social Studies. Gross and Badger (1960) reported that many studies had found that students at both the elementary and secondary level disliked social studies. Among the major complaints were dullness, uselessness, and excessive memorization of names, dates, and events. Gross and Badger attributed this dislike to the way in which social studies was organized and taught rather than to the inherent nature of the content. They suggested that one reason for the unpopularity of social studies was the large number of social studies teachers without adequate background and interest in the social sciences.

The state of student interest in social studies was not highlighted by any of the reviewers again until Ehman (in Hunkins et al. 1977) noted that one recent study had confirmed what researchers have asserted for years: students believe that social studies is less important for their occupational futures than English or math; grades are deemed more important than actual learning by students in social studies; social studies classroom atmosphere is not regarded as more interpersonally constructive than that of other classes; and social studies courses are considered "easy grades" compared to other subjects. The proportion of students reporting social studies to be very or extremely enjoyable was only somewhat greater than for math and about the same as for English. Ehman suggested that researchers should study discrepant subsamples (ones that rate social studies higher than other subsamples) to find out what the determinants of liking social studies are and whether they are manipulable.

Johnson, Payette, and Cox (1969) noted two studies that suggested a relationship between student interest and learning in the social studies (as well as teacher interest and student learning). This underlines the importance of examining factors affecting student interest.

Summary Observations

1) In comparison to research on instructional methods in social studies, there has been relatively little research on learner variables in the social studies. What research there is reflects only spotty attention to a few of the issues that might be investigated in this area.

2) In the fifties, the notion of "readiness" dominated practice in the social studies. Then, in the sixties, researchers began to question this. They instead emphasized the notion that children could handle a variety of time and chronology concepts; map, globe, and space concepts; and social science concepts earlier than was previously thought. In the seventies, there appears to be a pendular swing back to the notion of "readiness," phrased now in terms of Piaget's stages of intellectual development.

3) Only minimal attention has been given to questions regarding effects of socioeconomic status on social studies learning.

4) Students' cognitive styles have captured the attention of some researchers, but nothing of practical consequence for social studies has come from this new area of research as yet.

5) Some research has indicated that mental sets, such as dogmatism and rigidity, have adverse effects on certain learning processes.

6) The low student interest in and regard for the social studies found in the sixties has not changed in the seventies. There is some evidence that student interest is an important factor influencing social studies learning outcomes.

7) As can be seen from the above, hardly anything is known (or, at least, is reported by reviewers) about the effects of learner variables on social studies learning.

2.7 Research on the Effectiveness of the "New Social Studies"

This subsection notes that there have been no attempts to draw conclusions from the body of research surrounding the "new social studies" development projects.

Sources

The comprehensive reviews listed in the first part of this section were used as the primary basis for this section.

Documentation and Discussion

Research involving "new social studies" project materials, including those from the NSF-funded projects, was mentioned surprisingly infrequently in the comprehensive reviews. Copious evaluative research was conducted in conjunction with many of the "new social studies" projects and a number of independent evaluations were done on the projects' products (Wiley and Superka 1977). It may be that much of this work was not reported by reviewers because it was considered evaluation rather than pure research and/or because reports of this work were not widely disseminated.

The 1964 review by Harrison and Solomon is the first to take note of what later (in 1965) came to be called the "new social studies." Harrison and Solomon observed, "recent research has produced several exploratory studies and surveys concerning social studies courses that are not focused on history" (p. 190).

Although specific "new social studies" projects were occasionally mentioned in the subsequent comprehensive reviews, none were commented upon and the movement as a whole was not singled out for commentary again until Skretting and Sundeen's 1969 review. They cited a catalogue describing 90 social studies curriculum projects and then discussed the characteristics of the projects in general. They noted that the major efforts of the projects were being directed to able students and cognitive rather than affective outcomes. "Emerging foci" observed by Skretting and Sundeen included conceptual frameworks, sequencing of topics,readiness, the behavioral sciences as content, indepth studies by students, a "comprehensive world view," societal problems, and "inquiry amid a climate of experimentation and innovation."

In the same year (1969), Johnson, Payette, and Cox commented that very little research attention had been directed to producing data in support of "structure," apparently referring to the "structure of the disciplines" approach that was one common mark of the "new social studies" projects.

The movement as a whole was not commented upon again until 1977. Tucker (Hunkins et al. 1977) spent some time discussing the lack of interest, on the part of social studies educators with an academic-disciplines orientation, in research on teaching effectiveness and teacher education. In contrast, the social-issues educators had produced a huge amount of research on these topics. Both schools of thought--academic disciplines and social issues--were important elements in the "new social studies" movement.

Twenty-one "new social studies" projects were mentioned specifically in the comprehensive reviews. Of these, five were NSF projects (Comparing Political Experiences, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Sociological Resources for the Social Studies, Man: A Course of Study, and High School Geography Project).

With one exception, no interpretive comments were made by the comprehensive reviewers about any specific project. (This should perhaps not be too surprising, since very few of the comprehensive reviews contained commentaries on anything!) The exception was Comparing Political Experiences, which was lauded by Mortorella (Hunkins et al. 1977) for reflecting research findings in its strategies for concept teaching.

Beyond these few comments on the movement as a whole and on specific projects, the reviewers at most merely noted the presence of projects or, in a few cases, a movement. No reviewer mentioned or commented upon NSF's role in the movement or in specific projects.

From reading the comprehensive reviews, one certainly cannot get the impression that the "new social studies" was an important element in the professional lives of social studies educators during the sixties and seventies. One can barely detect that there even was such a movement in the field. The research literature of the period stands in stark contrast, in this respect, to other social studies literature of the era, in which the "new social studies"--its philosophy, it products, its advocates and critics--loomed large.

Summary Observation

Very little attention is given to the "new social studies" and the research efforts that centered on its products by the comprehensive reviewers. No attempts have been made to draw conclusions from the body of research surrounding the "new social studies."

2.8 Research on the Social and Political Knowledge, Skill, and Attitude Outcomes of Schooling

This subsection describes findings from national and state assessment and testing programs concerned with social studies and citizenship. The research presented here differs from that discussed in the preceding subsections in that it generally does not attempt to link outcomes to specific instructional methods, materials, and the like. At most, the research reported here attempts to link outcomes to gross variables such as amount of schooling in general and number of social studies courses taken. In the majority of studies and surveys described, no attempt is made to separate schooling effects from family, peer, or other environmental effects.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress is discussed first and then state testing programs. Next, we review national standardized testing programs and the debate over achievement test score declines. Finally we look at some studies of the effects of certain gross schooling variables (such number of hours of social studies taken) on political and social knowledge and attitudes.

Sources

The information presented in this section was drawn from National Assessment of Educational Progress reports on social studies and citizenship assessments, state department of education reports on statewide assessment and testing programs in social studies and citizenship, papers examining the national achievement test score decline of the past decade, and selected reports of research. Another cluster of sources that might have been employed in addition is reports of school district testing programs. Since very few district reports are available in ERIC, they are quite hard to obtain from the districts themselves, they are quite numerous, and they are likely to echo the national and state findings, we have decided not to include these in our analysis.

Beyond the above literature on student outcomes, there appear to be only a few research reports on isolated topics, such as student perceptions and knowledge of Africa South of the Sahara. These are too diverse and noncumulative to warrant special attention in this report.

Documentation and Discussion

National Assessment of Educational Progress: Social Studies

In 1971-72, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) administered its first Social Studies Assessment to a nationally representative sample of nine-, 13-, and 17-year-olds and young adults (ages 26-35). Results of its second Social Studies Assessment are not yet available, so no trends can yet be detected. (The second cycle of the Social Studies and the Citizenship Assessments were combined and conducted together during 1975-76. Although the complete data analysis from that assessment is not yet available, one special report on selected citizenship findings was produced in 1976 as a Bicentennial activity of NAEP. The results presented in this report are discussed below with the other Citizenship Assessment findings.)

Objectives. The Social Studies Assessment consisted of exercises in three areas, as follows (First Social Studies Assessment . . . 1974, pp. 2-3):

I. Skills
  A. Obtaining information
    1. Raises questions and seeks answers related to a variety of issues
    2. Identifies sources most suitable to solve a particular problem or find particular information
    3. Uses standard reference sources and aids to locate information

  B. Interpreting information
    1. Uses basic problem solving techniques of the social sciences to interpret information of various kinds
    2. Interprets graphs and maps effectively
    3. Uses a variety of non-traditional sources of information

II. Knowledges
  A. Economics
    1. Understands some of the basic characteristics of economic systems that are common to all industrial societies

  B. Geography
    1. Has knowledge of worldwide spatial distribution and interrelationship of the major features of man's physical and cultural environment

  C. History
    1. Understands some of the major developments in United States history
    2. Understands some of the major developments in world history

  D. Political science
    1. Knows some of the individuals and groups responsible for making government decisions
    2. Understands some of the rights and responsibilities granted in the Constitution
    3. Knows something about the election process and the role of political parties
    4. Understands some of the processes involved in political socialization

III. Attitudes
  A. Rights of the First Amendment
    1. Believes in the freedoms of the First Amendment and can justify that belief.

  B. The worth of the individual
    1. Believes people should become involved in making decisions that affect their lives
    2. Has a sense of responsibility for the interest of others
    3. Respects the views and feelings of all people
    4. Believes in the rule of law and can justify that belief

Summary of Findings. At the beginning of the report, a number of salient findings were summarized (First Social Studies Assessment . . . 1974, p. vii):

What National Assessment Data in Social Studies Indicate:

Selected Observations

1. Less than one half of America's 17-year-olds and young adults understand how to use all parts of a simple ballot.
2. Relatively few Americans can read and interpret graphs, maps or tables effectively.
3. A rather large gap exists between the attitudes Americans profess to hold and the actions they take in specific situations.
4. Exercises involving the recall of factual information are most difficult at all age levels.
5. Young Americans generally have very little knowledge about the contributions of minority groups to our culture and history.
6. Results indicate that one's out-of-school experiences are often as important as what one learns in school.
7. Blacks show a marked disadvantage in skills, knowledges and attitudes assessed at all age levels.
8. Females outperform males on skill exercises during the school years, but fall behind the males by age adult.
9. Females outperform males during the school years in the attitude exercises, but do less well than males at age adult.
10. Males consistently outperform females on knowledge exercises at all four age levels.
11. Southeasterners consistently perform below the national levels of success in all three areas.

To these might be added three other important findings discussed in the summary of results at the end of the report (First Social Studies Assessment . . . 1974, pp. 68-70). First, a chart showing the rank order of performance on various categories of objectives by age is provided:

Table 41

Rank Order of Median National Performance by Topic

Age 9

Attitudes/The worth of the individual
Skills/Obtaining information
Skills/Interpreting information
Knowledge/Geography
Knowledge/History

Age 13

Skills/Obtaining information
Skills/Interpreting information
Attitudes/The worth of the individual
Knowledge/Political science
Knowledge/History
Knowledge/Geography
Knowledge/Economics

Age 17

Skills/Interpreting information
Attitudes/The worth of the individual
Attitudes/First Amendment rights
Knwoledge/Political science
Knowledge/History
Knowledge/Economics
Knowledge/Geography

Adults

Skills/Interpreting information
Attitudes/The worth of the individual
Knowledge/Political science
Attitudes/First Amendment rights
Knowledge/History
Knowledge/Economics
Knowledge/Geography

Second, it is noted that

> 17-year-olds consistently perform above the level of 13-year-olds when comparisons are made of those exercises administered at both ages. On the other hand, the median performance levels for those exercises administered to both 17-year-olds and young adults are quite similar. Seventeen-year-olds generally performed between 1 and 3 percentage points above the adults. Only in the exercises involving First Amendment rights was their median performance noticeably different. The median performance level for 17-year-olds on these exercises was 7 percentage points above that of the adults.

Finally, the summary indicates that, in addition to southeasterners and blacks,

> those whose parents have had less than a high school education or those who live in a metropolitan area where a high proportion of residents are unemployed or on welfare, most likely would perform below national levels on the Social Studies exercises measured by National Assessment.

Performance on Knowledge Items. Because of NSF's particular interest in social science education, the tables showing performance levels on social science knowledge exercises are included in Appendix Table A-8 (First Social Studies Assessment 1974, pp. 29-34).

National Assessment of Educational Progress: Citizenship

During the school year 1969-70, the first cycle of NAEP's Citizenship Assessment was administered to a nationally representative sample of nine-, 13-, and 17-year-olds and young adults (age 26-35), totaling approximately 90,000 across the four age groups. The second Citizenship Assessment was administered during 1975-76 (in conjunction with the second Social Stndies cycle, as noted previously). One special report based on that assessment, Education for Citizenship: A Bicentennial Survey, is currently available; however, no trend analyses have yet been published.

Objectives: First Cycle. The report of national results from the first Citizenship Assessment listed the Citizenship objectives (National Assessment of Educational Progress. Citizenship: National Results 1970, pp. 118-120):

I. Show Concern for the Welfare and Dignity of Others

II. Support Rights and Freedoms of All Individuals

III. Help Maintain Law and Order

IV. Know the Main Structure and Functions of Our Governments

V. Seek Community Improvement Through Active, Democratic Participation

VI. Understand Problems of International Relations

VII. Support Rationality in Communication, Thought and Action on Social Problems

VIII. Take Responsibility for Own Personal Development and Obligations

IX. Help and Respect Their Own Families (Ages 9, 13, 17)

IX. Nuture the Development of Their Children as Future Citizens (Adults)

Summary of Findings by Age and Objectives: First Cycle. An overall summary of the first assessment pointed out that

> Progress from age 9 to age 17 was quite evident for most objectives, the greatest occurring between ages 9 and 13. Noteowrthy exceptions: 9's do about as well as 13's and 17's in small group tasks and civic action projects; 13's, 17's and adults were equally accepting of different races. Adults and 17's do about equally well overall, with 17's excelling slightly in some achievements and adults in others. Adults seem to know slightly more about current events and local affairs. No other consistent trend differentiates the two ages. (National Assessment of Educational Progress. Citizenship: National Results 1970, p. vii)

The summary also described particularly salient results and general trends for each of the nine objectives (National Assessment of Educational Progress. Citizenship: National Results 1970, pp. viii-ix):

A. Show concern for the well-being of others. High percentages express willingness to help others on a person-to-person basis, and know ways to do it. Help through organized action is given by only a small percentage of the population, however, and most name no more than two possible ways to influence government action in a helpful direction. At least two-thirds state they are willing to associate with people of other races in a variety of public situations and roles, and this degree of willingness remains virtually constant across age levels from 13 to adult.

B. Support rights and freedoms of all individuals. Support of individual rights and freedoms varies greatly according to the situation. Rights are usually supported by a majority in principle, but lose the support of most when the person whose freedom is in question represents a very unpopular or controversial cause. Tolerance of the unpopular thus seems rarer than acceptance of freedom in the abstract.

C. Recognize the value of just law. Those who are concerned at the apparent breakdown of respect for law may be encouraged to learn that over 90% of the respondents at ages 13 and older state at least one reason why laws are needed. This does not imply endorsement of all existing laws however, half the adults cite an example of a law which they think unjust.

D. Know the main structure and functions of government. Older students and adults understand the most basic principles and main structures of our government rather well; most exercises are answered correctly by three-fourths or more. Less is known at any age about the specific workings of government. Adults are generally better informed about local government and about current office-holders than are 17-year olds.

E. Participate in effective civic action. Voting records have revealed that about 60% of American adults vote in major elections. There are at least a dozen other different ways in which a citizen can influence civic decisions. Relatively few report attempting to do so, however; few people even name more than three or four possible ways.

Ability to cooperate effectively in a small democratic group is demonstrated by a majority of students at all ages.

F. Understand problems of international relations. At all ages there is a high level of awareness of way -- above 90%. Most respondents at all ages name at least one way to try to avoid way, although fewer adults than teenagers do so.

G. Approach civic decisions rationally. Most adults and older students show awareness of the more urgent problems which society faces (about three-fourth name at least three problems) and some of the ways it has attempted to alleviate them. Although less than half of 9-year olds recognize the need for differing viewpoints,most 17's and adults to recognize this need and are fairly rational and critical about civic issues.

H. Take responsibility for own development. A majority of students and about one-third of adults report some self-initiated action to further their own education. Four of five teenagers report talks with parents about career opportunities; by age 17 more than half report such talks with counselors or teachers.

I. Help and respect their own families. More than 95% of 9- and 13-year olds report helping with owrk around the home. Most adults show some familiarity with their children's school work.

Summary of Group Results: First Cycle. Results broken out by sex, region, size and type of community, parental education, and race are presented in two other reports (Campbell et al. 1971; Norris et al. 1972).

Differences by sex are summarized by Campbell et al. (1971):

> Boys and girls achieved about equally at age 9, on the average. A slight male advantage of 1% at the teen ages increases to 3% at the adult level. Males tended to know more about government, law and civic problems, and to support individual rights more. Men reported registering their views on civic issues more often, but more women than men reported taking action through civic organizations. Females were substantially ahead of males in giving educational attention to the children in their own families. (p. iii)

> The citizenship achievements of the two sexes often differ by 5% and in a few instances by more than 20%. The differences follow diverse patterns for different citizenship goals and types of achievement, often varying considerably across ages. The median sex differences favor males at most ages for four goals (B, C, D, F) in which most objectives concern knowledge of law, government and international problems, and support of individual rights. Women exceeded men substantially in Goal I, which mainly concerns care of family in educational ways. For the other four goals there is no consistent sex difference across ages. (p. 15)

Regional breakdowns are also summarized in the same report:

> The Northeastern, Central and Western regions achieved at similar levels overall, with the Northeast having perhaps a slight edge at ages 9 and 12. In the Southeast performance usually fell below the national average by a few percent at the older ages, with a smaller difference being typical at the younger ages.
>
> Compared to other regions respondents in the southeast less often reported accepting other races in public situations (12% to 14% lower than the nation as a whole). However, Southeastern adults led the nation in educational attention given to their own children and involvement in local government. (pp. iii-iv)

> The Northeast surpassed the nation at ages 9 and 13 on about half the nine citizenship goals. At age 13, the Central region performance matches the Northeast fairly closely for most goals (except C and E). The overall citizenship medians for Central and West are quite close across the four ages, but for all regions these overall medians mask a variety of differences on specific goals, some of which are reversed from one age level to another.
>
> The Southeast generally did less well at all ages than the nation as a whole. The Southeast deficit grew steadily larger through the school years from age 9 to 17. However, adults in the Southeast led the nation in educational care of their own children and were more involved in local government. (pp. 30-31)

Campbell et al. (1971) also summarize results for size of community:

> Average differences among community sizes for citizenship results as a whole were small and fairly consistent across ages. The Urban Fringe (areas surrounding big cities) and Medium-Size Cities held a small advantage over Big Cities and Smaller Places, with the Urban Fringe tending to pull ahead a little at the older ages.
>
> The Urban Fringe achieved its greatest advantage in knowledge of world and national problems and, at the older ages, in career planning and education of self and family. At the school ages, other community-size groups usually did as well as the Urban Fringe in giving personal help and taking civic action.
>
> In all groups and at all age levels assessed, a majority of respondents accepted association with other races in each public situation described. Fewer 13-year-olds in Big Cities than in the nation as a whole accepted association with other races, but more Big City adults did so. (p. iv)

> The Urban Fringe generally holds a small advantage compared to the nation on most of the nine citizenship goals. The goals on which the Urban Fringe is only average at school ages tend to be those involving personal help and interaction (A, E, I).

> Medium-Size Cities rank second on most of the nine goals. Big Cities and Smaller Places alternate in relative advantage for different goals at different ages, but performance for the two is nearly equivalent on the average and is fairly consistently lower than the nation as a whole. (p. 49)

Norris et al. (1972) present findings related to parental education, race, and size and type of community. They give an overview of these results as follows:

> The Citizenship findings generally parallel those of Science and of other studies in that repsondents from educationally advantaged homes and affluent communities achieve substantially more than respondents from less advantaged settings. Combining all ages, respondents whose parents had education behond high school succeeded about 12% more often on all Citizenship results combined than respondents who parents had only grade school education. Respondents from a-fluent suburban neighborhoods where there are high concentrations of professional and managerial occupations succeeded about 11% more often than those from inner city areas where unemployment is high. The corresponding advantage of affluent suburbs over rural areas was about 9%. Non-Blacks succeeded about 11% more often than Blacks on the Citizenship exercises.
>
> In other words, groups known to be educationally or socially disadvantaged perform at nociteably lower levels. This pattern is fairly consistent across Citizenship goals or types of achievement, but on some goals certain age groups show a different pattern of achievement. On a few specific exercises the usual pattern of achievement is actually reversed and these results are noted in the text of the report.
>
> The differences between advantaged and disadvantaged groups tended to be larger on those achievements calling for formal or abstract knowledge, as compared to achievements based on practical experience. For example, the group whose parents were highly educated did about 17% better than the group whose parents had the least education on Goal D (Knowledge of structure and function of government). In contrast, 9-year-olds from all parental education groups did equally well on a group task requiring cooperation in a question-asking game.
>
> Some of the exercises in Goal A (Show concern for the well-being of others) assessed verbally stated racial attitudes, and the results often followed a different pattern from other Citizenship results. Adults and 17-year-olds in the Black and inner city groups showed as much acceptance of other races as did the rest of the nation. But 13-year-olds in these two groups were substantially less accepting of other races. Such exercises may well have different meaning for different ethnic groups, of course.
>
> The report discusses the many problems in interpreting these results, in particular the fact that characteristics such as color, type of community, and parental education are highly related in the population sampled. An adjustment of the results to partially account for this fact is presented and discussed. (pp. ii-iii)

Second Cycle: Special Bicentennial Report. Although the full analysis of data from the 1975-76 Citizenship Assessment has not yet been completed, NAEP did produce a special report, in celebration of the Bicentennial, based on partial analysis of the results. This report presents selected findings for 13-year-olds and 17-year-olds in the areas of social attitudes, political attitudes, political knowledge, and political education.

The first chapter of the report gives the following overview of results (Education for Citizenship . . . 1976):

> The results of this study indicate that 13-year-olds and 17-year-olds express similar social and political attitudes and that these change very little during their secondary education. Their respect for the human rights of all Americans, regardless of race, sex, color, religious or political beliefs, is high, as is their estimation of the importance of participantion in the political process. However, during their secondary school years students acquire a great deal of information about politics, and this new knowledge increases their interest in the political process and, presumably, their effectiveness as citizens. (p. 1)
>
> . . . on overall performance 17-year-olds registered 6 percentage points higher than 13-year-olds (respective national means of 76 v. 70). Whites were just above the national average, while blacks trailed a few points behind. Thirteen-year-olds from the Northeast and Central states performed best at that age, followed by those from the Southeast and the West. Among 17-year-olds, the regional rankings were different: students from the Central states registered above the national mean and were followed in descending order by those from the Northeast, the West and the Southeast.
>
> Among the standard variables, the greatest differences were recorded among groupsing by educational level of the students' parents and by size and type of community. Students whose parents had some education beyond high school were above the national average; all others were below. In decending order, these were students whose parents had graduated from high school, had some high school education and had not attended high school. Among the different sizes and types of communities, students from the affluent urban and suburban communities (high metro) performed highest above the nation and students from low-income urban areas the furthest below. While 13-year-old students from rural areas were below the national level, 17-year-olds from these communities were above.

> Among both age groups, students who discussed national, state or local politics and international affairs in their classes did better than those who did not (Table 1). Those who rarely discussed politics were well below the national mean, and those who discussed politics frequently were considerably above.
>
> An additional special variable applied only to 17-year-olds. They were asked if they had studied how to acquire information about political issues in school and how to analyze the values and alternatives involved in political issues. Those who responded "a good deal" were 5 points above the national average, and those who replied "some" were 1 point above (Table 1). Students who answered "not much" performed nearly 6 points below the national mean.
>
> From the summary data, one can conclude that performance is closely related to race, the amount of education of the students' parents and the size and type of community in which the students live. Geographical region and the students' sex are the least important factors in determining performance. Analyses of other variables indicate that students who discussed politics tended to do better than others, and those who had studies politics the most did much better than those students who seldom studies politics. (pp. 3-4)

Social Attitudes. Results in regard to social attitudes were summarized in the marginal headings in the third chapter.

> --Most [respondents] oppose racial or religious discrimination.
>
> --Most oppose political and sex discrimination, but agreement between races and sexes is not uniform.
>
> --More females than males oppose sex discrimination in hiring.
>
> --Overall, females outperform males on social-attitudes exercises.
>
> --Class discussion and study of political issues do not greatly affect performance on social-attitudes items.
>
> --Racial trust is high, but there are still group differences.
>
> --Regions show different levels of willingness to have friends or leaders of a different race.
>
> --Nine out of 10 support equal-housing opportunity.
>
> --What would [the respondents] do if they saw someone fighting in the hall? Less than half would break it up.
>
> --Social attitudes change little between the ages of 13 and 17.

Overall, it was noted that

> For many of the variables, the trends for social attitudes are similar to those noted for overal performance . . . As it is for all items, parental education is an important factor, but the differences in performance according to size and type of community do not vary as greatly as before. Race remains a predictor at age 13, but less so for 17-year-olds. There are some fluctuations among geographic regions, with students at age 13 in the Northeast and at age 17 in the West being above the nation. (p. 9)

Political Attitudes. Summarizing the political attitudes findings, the report noted that

> Most of the trends described in the previous chapter are evident in this section on political attitudes . . . Again, the national performance level for 17-year-olds is higher than that of 13-year-olds (76% and 72%, respectively). The performance levels of the standard-variable groups identified by sex, parental education, and size and type of community conform to their overall performances. The most noticeable differences are that youth of both ages from the Southeast registered above the nation (1 point for 13-year-olds and 2 points for 17-year-olds) and that differences between the races are negligible. The special variables for both ages reflected the same trend for political attitudes as they did for performance over all exercises . . . (p. 15)

Marginal headings indicated specific attitudinal findings:

--Respondents express some doubt about the importance of voting.

--There is strong support for equal weight of each citizen's vote.

--Women's votes count as heavily as men's.

--Most believe educated people's votes should not count more than those of uneducated people.

--Should we have only one political party? "No," say two-thirds of the 13-year-olds and three-fourths of the older students.

--At least three out of four realize the President cannot censor the news media.

--Interest in politics is higher in the southeast and among blacks.

--Two-thirds indicate some amount of personal civic involvement.

Political Knowledge. Chapter 5 presents findings related to political knowledge. These include:

--Performance was very high on items dealing with criminal rights.

--Performance was lower on questions dealing with the powers of courts.

--Most students recognize their own constitutional rights, too.

--The Fifth Amendment right is not widely understood.

--Three out of four know that presidents, judges and army generals must always obey the law.

--One of every seven 17-year-olds thinks the President does not always have to obey the law.

--About half at each age know [sic] that the President can appoint people to congress.

--Performance on questions about the Senate and House was quite low.

--Few students know what steps Congress can take if a President sends troops to fight a war without Congressional approval.

--Awareness of local government functions is higher at age 17.

--Nearly helf of the 13-year-olds and three-fourths of the 17-year-olds know it is not against the law to start another political party.

--Understanding of United Nations is not widespread.

--Most know that laws can be changed and know several ways to get changes made; however, performances of groups varied widely.

Summarizing the results on political knowledge, the report said:

> The most notable difference in performance between ages 13 and 17 was registered in the area of political knowledge. In their replies to 34 questions, 13-year-olds established a national performance level of 62%, while the level for 17-year-olds answering the same questions was 71%. The percentage of 13-year-olds answering correctly was higher than that for 17-year-olds on only 2 of the 34 items.
>
> The performance for the standard variable groups on questions of political knowledge reflected the same trends as for performance over all exercises, but the comparative differences between group and national performance were more extreme in this category than in any other . . . Thirteen-year-olds from low-socioeconomic urban communities were 5 points below the nation, while those from affluent urban and suburban areas were 7 points above. Whites registered 1 point above the nation, but blacks were 6 points below. Three points separated the performance levels of males and females. In the geographical regions, students from the Northeast and Central states were about 2 points above the nation, while those from the Southeast were nearly 1 point below and those from the West nearly 3 points below.

> Seventeen-year-olds performed similarly. Eleven points separated those students whose parents had some post-high school education from those whose parents had not attended high school. There were 7 points separating students in the low-income urban areas from those in the high-income urban and suburban schools. Seventeen-year-olds from rural areas were about 1 point above the nation, whites were 1 point above the nation and blacks were 7 points below. Males were 2 points above and females 2 points below the national performance level. Students from the Northeast and the Central states again were higher than those from the Southeast and the West, but the differences were not as great. For both ages, performances according to the special variables coincided closely with overall trends . . . (p. 21)

Political Education. Findings related to the amount and kind of political education respondents have had are particularly interesting. NAEP Citizenship and Social Studies Assessments had not collected this kind of data previously. It may be possible, with the addition of this information, to detect some relationships between curriculum and instruction, on the one hand, and performance, on the other.

Four generalizations are given in the marginal headings of Chapter 6, on political education:

--Most students report open and comfortable school environments.

--Considerably more older students report classroom discussion of political issues.

--Eight out of 10 17-year-olds report that social studies courses increased their interest in government, public affairs or politics.

--Seventeen-year-olds believe thier civics, history and government courses are relevant and present accurate pictures of American politics.

Additional summary observations are provided in the narrative:

> As usual, most of the standard variables reflected the typical overall patterns of performance . . . The two notable exceptions were in the categories of sex and race. For both ages, females registered higher than males (4 points difference for 13-year-olds and 2 points difference for 17-year-olds). For 13-year-olds, blacks were about 3 points above whites, while at age 17, whites were nearly 1 point above blacks. The most remarkable findings were among the speical variables. They conformed to the usual patterns, but the ranges were much greater . . . There was a 33-point difference at age 13 and a 32-point spread at age 17 between students who said they discussed politics rarely and those who discussed politics frequently. Among 17-year-olds, those who admitted that they had studied

> politics very little were 10 points below the national level. Those who studied politics a good deal were 9 points above. These figures, like those for special variables in earlier sections, showed strong evidence that course work in classes related to politics was an important factor in higher levels of performance. (p. 31)
>
> Have students studied how to acquire information about political issues? Sixty-six percent of the 17-year-olds said they had studied this in some degree. Males were significantly above the national mean by 2 points on this item and females 3 points below. Have they studies how to analyze the values and alternatives involved in political issues? Again, 66% of the older students said they had.
>
> In conclusion, course work in classes related to politics appears to be an important factor in performance. Such courses generally increase interest in political affairs. Schools appear to have an open climate in which students are encouraged to express themselves, to think critically and feel free to disagree with their teachers. And, most of America's teenagers believe their course work gives them relevant, useful training for effective citizenship. (pp. 34-35)

State Testing Programs in Citizenship and Social Science/Social Studies

According to two surveys conducted in 1973, 35 states and territories of the U.S. had conducted, were planning to conduct, or were considering conducting statewide testing programs in social science/social studies and/or citizenship--29 in social science/social studies and 18 in citizenship. (See Table A-9 in the Appendix). As of 1975, at least two more states could be added to the list: both Delaware and North Carolina had published reports on their statewide assessment or testing programs, which included some coverage of these areas.

Only eight reports of testing/assessment programs in social science/social studies and citizenship could be located in the ERIC system. These are listed in Table A-10 (Appendix). The salient findings from each of these reports are summarized below.

Colorado. In the spring of 1971, the Colorado State Department of Education administered a testing program to aseess learner needs in the state to randomly selected students in grades 3, 6, 9, and 12. One section of the assessment instrument dealt with social knowledge and skills. This was designed to acquire information related to two of the performance objectives adopted by the State Board of Education:

> All students shall acquire levels of knowledge of home, community, nation, and world which enable them to function in a manner appropriate to their age environment.
>
> All students shall demonstrate a knowledge of and appreciation for a democratic form of government.
>
> (Helper 1972, pp. 45-46)

Assessment items were drawn from NAEP, the Instructional Objectives Exchange, and standardized tests in the social studies.

The exercises included items on map reading, demonstrating knowledge of social organizations (reasons for laws, organization of government, legal processes), identifying appropriate social processes, and historical perspective.

A table comparing overall performance of selected subgroups to that of all respondents was presented in the report (Helper 1972, p. 54); this is presented as Table 42. The report noted that the response patterns in social studies for the various subgroups were quite similar to that found in mathematics, science, health and language arts: "The minority students, students from low-income and low-education families, and from industrial communities scored consistently lower"(Helper 1972, p. 54).

Table 42.

AVERAGE PERCENT CORRECT ON SOCIAL STUDIES EXERCISES: PUPIL POPULATION GROUPS COMPARED WITH STATE AVERAGE

		Grades			
		3	6	9	12
Sex:	Boys	+0.7	+1.7	+1.6	+2.2
	Girls	-0.5	-1.4	-1.7	-1.6
Ethnicity:	Black	-11.5	-4.2	-12.7	-16.3
	Chicano	-7.8	-7.7	-9.8	-5.6
	Bilingual	-7.0	-9.7	-11.2	-7.8
Father's Education:					
	Grade School	-7.3	-7.3	-5.6	-1.7
	High School	0.0	-0.1	+0.2	+0.3
	College	+6.4	+3.9	+4.7	+2.5
Family Income:					
	Less than $4500	-6.1	-5.6	-11.2	-7.2
	$4500-$9000	+0.6	+0.3	+2.5	0.0
	More than $9000	+4.2	+5.7	+7.8	+3.6
Community:	Rural	-3.7	+0.5	+1.8	+2.4
	Res/Ind/Com	-4.4	-2.2	-1.3	-2.8
	Residential	+0.9	0.0	-0.6	+0.3

Minus (-) indicates that the group scored below the state average.
Plus (+) indicates that the group scored above the state average.

Delaware. In the spring of 1975, 26,500 students in public schools and 1,060 in parochial schools in Delaware were tested in reading, English, mathematics, science, and social studies. Grades four and eight were tested in social studies while grade one was not.

The summary at the beginning of the report indicated that, for all subject areas tested,

> When differences between the groups in measured ability are taken into consideration, the performance of fourth-grade students in Delaware is superior to that of a national norming group on identical items embedded in the test batteries. (Handrick 1975, p. i)

In social studies specifically, results were summarized as follows:

> Fourth-grade students are equally proficient in the general areas of inquiry skills and social studies understandings. They have difficulty in understanding cultural variation. (p. ii)

For grade eight, the overall summary stated that:

> The performance of eighth-grade students in Delaware is inferior to that of a national norming group on identifcal items embedded in the test battery even when differences in measured ability of the two groups are considered. (p. ii)

Eighth-graders' social studies performance was summarized as follows:

> Eighth-grade students are more proficient in the area of social understandings than in that of inquiry skills. They have difficulty identifying reliable and unreliable sources of information in a given situation. (p. iii)

Further detail was given for fourth-grade social studies performance in the body of the report:

> Fourth-grade students performed at about the same level of proficiency in answering the items designed to measure the two major categoreis of social studies objectives: inquiry skills and understandings. They performed best on the items concerned with an understanding of land-man interaction, and had the greatest difficulty with items dealing with an understanding of cultural variation. (p. 13)

Eighth-grade social studies performance was also elaborated a bit:

> On the average, a greater percentage of eighth-grade students correctly answered the items dealing with social studies understandings than the percentage who correctly answered those dealing with inquiry skills. They were most proficient in answering items concerning an understanding of land-man interaction, and least proficient in answering those dealing with the identification of reliable and unreliable sources of information in a given situation. (p. 18)

Hawaii. In February 1971, Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP) Social Studies test was administered to students in grades 5, 7, 9, 11, and 12 in Hawaii. (The STEP Science and Listening tests were also administered at the same time.)

Overall, the STEP Social Studies results indicated that "a typical student in the seventh grade [achieved] as well as the national norm group. Although the ninth and eleventh graders [were] performing slightly below national average level, the fifth and twelfth graders [were] very much below the norm" (Loui 1972, pp. 35, 38). More detailed explanations of strengths and weaknesses within specific areas of social studies were not provided. (The STEP Social Studies test measures reading and interpret maps, charts, diagrams, and printed word "to see relationships among basic facts, trends and concepts, and to analyze critically materials pertaining to effective citizenship in our society" (p. 35).)

Maine. The Maine Department of Education tested a statewide probability sample of 17-year-olds in both public and nonpublic schools on citizenship and writing during 1972. A total of 2,000 out of a school population of 17,000 in the state were tested. The NAEP model was followed.

The objectives examined in the Maine Assessment of Educational Progress were (Maine Assessment . . . 1972, p. 64):

Citizenship Objectives

I	Show Concern for the Welfare and Dignity of Others
II	Support Rights and Freedoms of All Individuals and Recognize the Value of Just Law
III	Know the Main Structure and Functions of Government
IV	Participate in Civic Action
V	Understand Problems in International Relations and Approach Civic Decisions Rationally
VI	Take Responsibility for Own Development

The results of the Maine assessment in citizenship are neatly summarized on pages 65-66 of the report (Maine Assessment . . . 1972):

> In the area of Citizenship, the following summary conclusion may be drawn:
>
> Reviewing all Citizenship results together, the tendency was for Maine 17-year-olds to surpass national performance on concern for the well-being of others and respect for their rights as individuals. However, national achievement was so low in some of these areas that even Maine should not take comfort. Better understanding of constitutional freedoms in real life and the development of practical skills in citizen participation in government are the two main challenges to civic educators revealed by this assessment.

Massachusetts. During 1975-76, 8,000 nine- and 17-year olds throughout the state of Massachusetts were tested in citizenship and social studies. The NAEP exercises in social studies were adapted for use in the state; citizenship items were drawn from Joint Council on Economic Education tests, developed anew by educators in the state, and taken from instruments that had been used nationally.

The report (Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program . . . 1976) states that, overall Massachusetts students did as well or better than the NAEP Northeast sample on social studies. They were also high in comparison to the national sample's performance. The Massachuseets Assessment also found that high-socioeconomic status students did better, as was to be expected. Also, students from big cities fell behind their peers. Students with more highly educated parents and students in college-bound programs performed better.

The Citizenship Assessment also included national and regional comparisons with results similar, in general, to those reported for student performance on social studies.

The Massachusetts Assessment also collected data on student participation and correlated this with test results. It was found that participation in school service and community activities correlated with high test performance, including strong citizenship values. Participants in student government and school publications performed particularly well on some citizenship objectives. Participants in political groups outside the school showed the highest performance levels in social studies.

There was no strong connection between self-esteem and performance. Also, there was little evidence of extreme scores on cynicism measures for Massachusetts 17-year-olds.

New Mexico. New Mexico's State Department of Education has reported on the administration of the American College Test (ACT) to college-bound seniors in the state. The test consists of four sections, in English, mathematics, social studies, and natural science.

In 1971-72, 9,107 of the college-bound students in New Mexico took ACT, approximately 45 percent of the 12th-grade students registered at the beginning of the school year. The report for that year devoted considerable attention to the ACT test score declines in New Mexico. It noted that scores for 1971-72 showed decreases in comparison to the 1967-68 scores in every area except natural sciences. "The social studies test shows the greatest decrement--17.7 in 1971-72, down from 19.3 in 1967-68" (Analysis of Statewide Testing Program Results, 1972-73 . . . 1973, p. 42).

The 1972-73 ACT administration tested 8,701 students, approximately 42 percent of the 12th-grade students registered at the beginning of the school year. The report for that year's testing noted that the previous years' downward trend may have been halted or reversed in all areas but social studies for New Mexico students.

A discussion of test scores declines nationwide and the possible reasons for these declines can be found in the following section on results of national testing programs.

North Carolina. Approximately 2,500 randomly selected third graders took the 1973-74 North Carolina social studies test as part of that state's Assessment of Educational Progress. The instrument was developed by state agency consultants, drawing on the SCORE item bank, released exercises from NAEP, other states' assessment instruments, and items developed by the state consultants.

The North Carolina report provides a useful summary in the highlights of the social studies assessment (Social Studies. Grade 3. . . . 1975, pp. 13-14):

> North Carolina's third-grade students scored satisfactorily or better on approximately two-thirds of the social studies objectives measured.

The highlights section of the report also discusses the relation of environmental factors to performance (p. 15):

> Of the significant factors associated with educational opportunity and achievement, parental educational level and family income are important. Across all objectives tested, we see the results. In families where at least one parent had some education beyond high school, the achievement scores are high. Achievement is lowest among students who come from homes where neither parent reached the eight grade. A similar pattern exists for family income--high incomes are associated with high achievement and low incomes with low achievement.

Also, the highlights section indicates tentative results from a special oral-interview assessment with 450 third graders (p. 15):

> (1) North Carolina's students believe that conflicts are best resolved by a third party;
>
> (2) in conjunction, they believe that the major function of laws should be to punish wrongdoers and protect citizens;
>
> (3) their responses to the oral items would indicate that without formal training in cognitive moral development, they tend to respond to social conflicts as theorized by Kohlberg . . .; and
>
> (4) results from the written and oral tests indicate that our third graders do not respond differently on these two types of tests.

A second kind of reporting format was a table showing not only student performance on each objective but also teacher ratings of the objectives, data on whether they are being taught in class, and predictions of their students' responses. This table (from pages 85-87 of the report) is included in the Appendix (Table A-11)

South Carolina. In the fall of 1975, the South Carolina State Department of Education administered the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills to all students in grades four and seven and a sample of 11th graders. This test battery includes a section on social studies, as well as sections on reading, language, mathematics, reference skills, and science.

The following three tables show state and national results for the 1975 testing and differences between state and national results for both the 1975-76 and the 1974-75 school years (Johnson and Finch 1976, pp. 45, 50, and 53):

Table 43.

SOUTH CAROLINA VERSUS NATIONAL ITEM PERCENTAGES CORRECT
FOR EACH SUBSKILL AREA, ALL STUDENTS, GRADE 4

Tests and Subtests	State % Correct	National % Correct	Difference 75-76	74-75
Reading				
Reading Vocabulary	52%	61%	-9	(-10)
Reading Comprehension	54%	52%	-8	(- 9)
Language				
Spelling	70%	75%	-5	(- 5)
Language Mechanics	57%	64%	-7	(- 8)
Language Expression	56%	65%	-9	(-10)
Mathematics				
Mathematics Computation	62%	72%	-10	(-12)
Mathematics Concepts	62%	71%	-9	(-10)
Mathematics Applications	54%	63%	-9	(- 9)
Reference Skills	53%	58%	-5	(- 6)
Science	48%	54%	-6	(- 7)
Social Studies	44%	50%	-6	(- 7)

Table 44.

SOUTH CAROLINA VERSUS NATIONAL ITEM PERCENTAGES CORRECT FOR EACH SUBSKILL AREA, ALL STUDENTS, GRADE 7

Tests and Subtests	State % Correct	National % Correct	Difference 75-76	74-75
Reading				
Reading Vocabulary	64%	70%	-6	(-6)
Reading Comprehension	63%	66%	-3	(-3)
Language				
Spelling	76%	79%	-3	(-3)
Language Mechanics	66%	69%	-3	(-3)
Language Expression	61%	65%	-4	(-4)
Mathematics				
Mathematics Computation	68%	73%	-5	(-6)
Mathematics Concepts	61%	66%	-5	(-4)
Mathematics Application	62%	67%	-5	(-5)
Reference Skills	66%	68%	-2	(-2)
Science	54%	56%	-2	(-2)
Social Studies	53%	57%	-4	(-3)

Table 45.

SOUTH CAROLINA VERSUS NATIONAL ITEM PERCENTAGES CORRECT FOR EACH SUBSKILL AREA, GRADE 11

Tests and Subtests	State % Correct	National % Correct	Difference 75-76	74-75
Reading				
Reading Vocabulary	54%	61%	-7	(-8)
Reading Comprehension	55%	61%	-6	(-7)

Language				
Spelling	63%	66%	-3	(-5)
Language Mechanics	67%	70%	-3	(-5)
Language Expression	57%	61%	-4	(-6)
Mathematics				
Mathematics Computation	58%	65%	-7	(-9)
Mathematics Concepts	58%	64%	-6	(-8)
Mathematics Applications	47%	56%	-9	(-9)
Reference Skills	62%	65%	-3	(-4)
Science	50%	54%	-4	(-5)
Social Studies	55%	58%	-3	(-4)

No breakdowns of results within the social studies area are provided.

National Testing Programs: The Achievement Test Score Decline

The nation has become alarmed in the last few years over declines in achievement test scores. Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) have produced the most comprehensive examination of this phenomenon to date. They describe the situation as follows (pp. 1-5):

> Through the nineteen-forties, fifties, and up to the mid-sixties, achievement tests scores steadily increased. Since then, many test scores drop. The reported test score declines are more dramatic in recent years and most evident for higher grades. They are especially pronounced in verbal tests, but hold for nearly all tested areas. Specifically:
>
> --Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). Nationwide, college-bound high school seniors show a decline in verbal and mathematical scores over the past decade. Females who used to earn higher scores than males in verbal aptitudes fell below the male average, indicating a more drastic drop for them than for male students. The mathematic scores show less large and substantially equal declines for males and females; we note that female students have always had lower average dcores than males.

--American College Testing Program (ACT). Another test, widely used for college-bound high school seniors, supports the downward trend of the SAT scores in English and mathematics, although female students do not exhibit the dramatic drop in English as in the SAT Verbal score, but stay considerably above the average male scores. Social Studies scores show a larger decrease. Here, females' test scores dropped more than males. Only Natural Science scores have remained at the same average level over the past decade.

--Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT). The nationwide test scores of high school juniors do not show systematic declines over the past decade. However, female students seem to have lost their lead over males in verbal aptitudes. They recently dropped below the male average score. On the other hand, the smaller difference in male and female mathematical scores indicates a slight, although non-systematic, rise of junior high school females' test scores.

--Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test (MSAT). This test, taken by more than 90 percent of high school juniors in Minnesota, reproduces the SAT and ACT trends. Scores rose steadily to the mid-sixties and have declined since, continously.

--Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED). These are widely used tests in senior high school (grades 9-12). Looking only at scores from the State of Iowa, we find basically the same pattern of decline as for the SAT, ACT, and MSAT test scores. Twelfth graders' score declines are prominent, but a decline of vocabulary and mathematic scores can be found, for the same time period, for all senior high school graders.

--Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). These tests, spanning grades 1 through 8, show the same trend of decline down to grade 4. Third graders do not show a decrease in test scores over the past decade. But if we follow the earlier third graders through their schooling career, they participate in the pattern of score declines in later grades.

--Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS). These tests are similar in intent to the ITBS, but start at grade 2 and extend to grade 10. A similar change pattern emerges in the comparison of norm data from 1968 and 1973. Small gains are generally observed in 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grades, while losses, widening with each increasing grade, occur for grades 5 through 10.

--National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The NAEP conducts educational progress assessments in ten subject areas for 9-, 13- and 17-year olds, in four-year cycles. The three areas for which change data are available are Science (1969 to 1973), Functional Literacy/Basic Reading Performance for 17-year olds only (1971 and 1974), and Writing Mechanics (1969 to 1974).

The pattern of change in science shows general declines. 9-year olds' (about 4th grade) performance from 1970 to 1973, and 13-year olds' (about 8th grade) performance from 1969 to 1972 diminished on two-thirds of the test items. Even greater drops occurred for 17-year olds (11th and 12 graders) who performed more poorly on 76 percent of the items administered in 1969 and 1973. The results for the Reading-Literacy assessment show an opposite trend. 17-year olds' performance levels have increased over the three-year period, while their writing skills have declined, on the average, due especially to a considerably higher proportion of poor writers. However, the proportion of very good writers increased slightly. 13-year olds write, in general, poorer quality essays. But 9-year olds improved their writing skills somewhat. Females, in all age groups, show on the average, higher quality writing skills than the males, although their decline pattern follows that of the males.

--Stanford-Binet. An intelligence test score study of preschoolers, 10-year olds, and adolescents, contrasting performance in the early thirties with that in 1972 puctuates the situation. Preschoolers of 1972 had, on the average, a 10-point higher score than their age-mates of the thirties; 10-year olds averaged only 2 points higher and adolescents showed about 6 point higher scores. But, a comparison of the scores of the 1972 preschoolers with their scores 3 years later showed an average 3 point drop. Another startling block in an emerging mosiac.

Grossly, the typical line of trend over the past fifteen years for all testing programs was a steady increase in all tested subject areas up the mid-xisties, and a drop since, to roughly a level in 1970 that was first reached in the early sixties. But a further and steeper decrease has occurred in the past few years to a level, e.g., for the SAT, below that of the first modern SAT in the forties.

Only two of the test programs reviewed by Harnischfeger and Wiley, as well as other commentators on the test score decline, yield separable social studies scores. These are the ACT and the ITED. In both, the social studies scores have declined along with other subtest scores. The ACT social studies scores showed the largest decreases of all the ACT subtests, as noted above. However, no special attention has been given to this particular aspect of the test score declines.

A host of explanations of the test score decline have been offered. Suggested reasons fall into three categories: changes in the tests themselves; changes in the test-taking pool; and changes in student preparation and motivation.

Tests. Three possible explanations related to the tests themselves have been advanced.

1) The tests are getting harder. Munday (1976) dismisses this possibility after examination of the data for the ACT.

2) Content and scaling shifts have occurred in the tests. Both Munday (1976), for the ACT, and Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) for all the achievement tests listed above dismiss this possibility.

3) The tests do not measure aptitude, they are race and class biased, and their results are misused. Although some critics have raised these issues in connection with the test score declines, it is difficult to see how such factors can possibly account for changes in scores during the last decade. Edson (1976) points out that these issues are only tangentially related to the issue of test score trends.

Test-taking Pool. Apparently more promising are arguments related to changes in the kinds of people taking the tests. Five possibilities have been advanced here.

1) The number of women taking college-admissions tests has increased over the last decade. Now it is not only the "bright" women who apply to college. Munday (1976) puts heavy emphasis on this change in the test-taking pool as a major reason for the ACT overall decline:

> Clearly, the ACT composit decline over these years [1965-66 to present] for the total group was not equally shared by men and women. It is due to the substantial decline in test scores for women. (p. 7)

Although women's test scores have declined more than men's on the college tests, this is not consistently the case on tests administered to the broader population of students. For instance, on the ITED there was a bigger decline for boys than for girls (Munday 1976). This suggests, then, that the college-admissions score declines might at least partially be attributed to the changes in the test-taking pool ("we are getting a somewhat more selective group of men in college, and a considerably less selective group of women," as Munday states it on page 18 of his paper), but that the more general declines might be attributed to other factors.

Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) state that females' verbal test scores have decreased more than those of males overall. They suggest several reasons for the female declines that go beyond the change-in-pool hypothesis, but which are appropriately mentioned here since the women's issue has been broached (p. 117):

> Why have females' verbal test scores decreased more than those of males? Any answer to this question has to consider the earlier, usual score leads that females had in language, verbal, and writing tests. These were often attributed to more consistent study habits of females in- and outside of school. The search for an explanation might consider this speculation. If females now take fewer courses in traditional curricular areas, if they have and do less homework, and if they increasingly exchange television viewing for reading and learning, then their score losses should be greater, because their scores have been relatively more dependent on these work habits and course enrollements than those of males.

2) Some have suggested that more minorities and economically disadvantaged students may be taking the test. However, both Munday (1976) and Edson (1976) point out that the proportion of minority test takers for the ACT and SAT has not changed during the period of greatest decline. Further, the SES data gathered on takers of these two tests does not support the contention that more low-SES students are taking the tests or that fewer upper-income students are taking them.

3) Some have suggested that fewer of the "bright" students are opting for college and taking the college-admissions tests now than in the past. The evidence here is not clear. According to Munday (1976) the percentage of high-scoring students had decreased on the SAT but remained stable on ACT. The percentage of low-scoring students has increased on both. The overall variability of student achievement has increased.

4) Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) argue that one very good possibility may be the change in the drop-out rate since the early 1950s. The school drop-out rate decreased substantially between 1950 and 1966 and levelled off after that time. More lower achievers are staying in school and taking at least the general achievement tests if not the college admissions test.

5) One change in the test-taking population for the SAT is that more students are using their junior-year scores for college admissions instead of taking the test a second time in the senior year. This, however, would account for only a trivial amount of the decline, according to Edson (1976).

Student Preparation and Motivation. A third set of possible explanations of the score declines suggests that the declines are not merely artifacts of changes in the tests or the test-taking pool. Rather, the declines reflect real changes in student knowledge, abilities, and motivations. Reasons offered here may be grouped into two categories: school influences and societal influences.

1) School influences.

a) Changes in the pupil composition of classes and whole schools (for instance, increased school populations and class sizes, desegregated classes, ungraded classrooms, frequent turnover related to increased pupil mobility, ability mixes resulting from increased retention rates) have been suggested as possible factors affecting student learning and motivation. Harnischfeger and Wiley (1976) point out that the only systematic data on such factors concerns racial desegregation patterns and retention rates. Since desegregation has been mainly a regional phenomenon affecting the South, this cannot account for national trends. (Munday points out that the declines are nationwide, not restricted to certain states or regions.) Retention (or drop-out) rates have been discussed above; these may have some effect.

b) Changes in school organization and resources (such as double sessions, school consolidation, teacher aides, other resources afforded by programs such as ESEA Title I) might have affected student learning and motivation. However, we have no consistent data on these possibilities, according to Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975).

c) Changes in the quantity of schooling is another possibility suggested by Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975). They point out that the average length of the school year has been relatively stable at 180 days since about 1960. However, average daily attendance peaked in 1965-66 and has been dropping ever since (along with the drop in the drop-out rates). Thus, decreases in the amount of time spent in school are another strong possibility for explanation.

d) Changes in the curriculum are one of the strongest candidates for explaining the decline in test scores, according to Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975). They examine enrollements by subject area and present the following general conclusions (pp. 98-99):

> --There has been a general enrollment drop in academic courses.
>
> --This general decline has come about mostly because of substantial decreases in general course taking which have not been substantially replaced by increases in elective or specialty courses.
>
> --There has been a sizable drop in the proportions of pupils enrolling in the traditional basic courses of the college preparatory curricula, Algebra, first-year foreign languages, Chemistry, and Physics.

- --There have been, by 1972/73, no sizable declines in advanced college preparatory courses. It is not clear whether this was due to stable basic enrollments of those who traditionally take advanced work, or whether the enrollment drops in more basic courses had not yet reached advanced levels by 1972/73.
- --The decrease in academic course taking is not compensated by increases in practical courses giving preparation for employment and home making.
- --We lack information on what pupils' activities have changed to. Possible factors are: lowered instructional offerings and increasing work-study programs not counted as courses.

In regard to social studies, they examine enrollments from 1970-71 to 1972-73. History enrollments showed no sizeable drop overall, but there was a redistribution. "Regular" history course taking dropped, with the largest declines in U.S. (-7%) and state (-14%) history and world history remaining at about the same level. Electives and specialized courses took up the slack, increasing from an enrollment of 6.9 percent to 9.2 percent over the two-year period. Enrollments in other academic areas, such as English and mathematics, showed similar patterns.

Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) believe that curriculum changes offer the strongest explanation among school-related influences for the decline in test scores. Munday (1976), on the other hand, directly contradicts this, stating that there probably has not been a major curriculum redirection at the high school level in the last ten years. His evidence for this conclusion, however, is quite weak and indirect compared to the evidence offered by Harnischfeger and Wiley.

e) Teacher characteristics are another suggested influence. Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) note that the data here are mixed and that, in any event, existing evidence does not provide direct links between changes in teacher characteristics and test score changes. They point out that teachers in 1973 were somewhat better educated (had higher degrees) than teachers in 1960; on the other hand, average years teaching experience of the teaching force as a whole was less in 1970 than in 1960. Edson (1976) mentions some other possible factors--teacher militancy and unions, additional demands on teachers' time (such as filling out more reports, handling discipline problems) and the like--but offers no data regarding these arguments.

f) Racial tensions in the schools are sometimes cited as possible contributing factors (Edson 1976), but no evidence linking this to test score declines has been offered.

g) Discipline problems, not only as they take up additional teacher time but also as they distract other students' attention, have also been mentioned (Edson 1976), but again no data are offered in support of this as a factor.

h) Tightening school budgets, with resultant decreases in services and cutbacks in educational programs, are sometimes suggested (Edson 1976). Again, no evidence is offered.

j) Changes in educational philosophy, with greater emphasis on creativity and spontaneity and less on structure and traditional content, is often noted. Many accuse the schools of emphasizing "fads and frills" at the expense of "the basics." (Edson 1976) Here, too, evidence is lacking.

2) Societal influences.

a) Television, like the schools, seems to get blamed for much that is "wrong" in our society. Both Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) and Edson (1976) cite critics who attribute the test score decline to increased TV watching among students. Harnischfeger and Wiley note that they did not find any data to enlighten us on the question of whether television watching decreases the time devoted to homework, reading, and family interaction. Set ownership had steadily increased since the Second World War; but, in the mid-seventies, TV watching apparently reached a saturation point, as indicated by a six percent decrease in viewing time (in either 1974 or 1975--it is not clear from Harnischfeger and Wiley's statement). They suggest that TV may have positive effects on children's learning during the early school years and detrimental effects as the child moves to higher grades; this would be consistent with the steady or improved scores found until about the third grade and the declining scores occuring after that.

b) Decreasing acceptance of societal norms by youth may be another factor in the score decline picture. Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) note the increases in youth crime and drug use, but point out that there is no data connecting these phenomena with test scores. Another possible aspect of decreasing acceptance of traditional societal norms might be the apparent decrease among young people who view education as being "extremely important" for success in later life, according to Gallup Poll findings cited by Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975). They further note that the payoff for education in our society is presently declining and that this is recognized by youth, as indicated by the lower college enrollments by middle-class children. Further, both Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) and Edson (1976) note the rise of the counterculture, which has apparently diverted young people's attention from traditional academic interests and drawn them into various emotional, expressive, and religious realms. None of these apparent shifts in societal values, or in youth's acceptance of societal values, have been well documented, much less linked by solid evidence to test score declines.

c) Changes in family structure and values is another cluster of factors often suggested as contributing to test score declines. Harnischfeger and Wiley (1975) note increases in the proportion of working mothers, decreases in the number of adults in family units, increases in the number of single-parent families, and increases in the number of illegitimate children. However, they are not able to relate these directly to the test score declines. They also hypothesize some possible relationships between the post-war baby-boom and the declines: children were born to younger parents in less economically advantageous environments; closer spacing of children was characteristic and this has been shown to have generally negative effects on achievement (parents are able to give less individual attention to each child). None of these hypotheses has been confirmed.

Summary. It would appear that the following hypotheses hold the best potential as explanations of the achievement test score declines:

--change to a greater proportion of women in the college-admissions test-taking pool

--change in the composition of school and classroom populations due to the decreased drop-out rate

--change in the quantity of schooling due to decreases in average daily attendance

--changes in curriculum and subject enrollements

It should be noted, however, that these explanations appear to be the strongest because the data for them are more readily available than for other proposed explanations.

As mentioned before, social studies score declines have not received specific attention. The only proposed explanation for declines in this area for which data have been presented is the curriculum change hypothesis. If curriculum change in social studies is the prime culprit for the comparatively heavy declines in this area, then two courses of action are implied: either change the curriculum back to its prior configuration (re-institute survey course requirements and the like) or change the tests to assess the altered curriculum (for instance, include more social science items and fewer historical questions). However, that if is a big one; closer examination of the social studies declines may be warranted before any action can be recommended. For instance, student motivation may be a particularly important contributor to social studies declines. A recent survey by Fernández et al. (1975) showed that social studies, which has always been one of the least-liked school subjects, was perceived by students as being considerably less relevant and useful than English or mathematics in preparing them for success in future occupations. Further, suburban students, who are generally higher achievers, rated social studies even lower in this respect than did urban students. Might this not have some bearing on the declines in social studies scores, which are generally larger than declines in English and mathematics?

Finally, an ironic note raised by Munday (1976): Why didn't anybody ever ask for an explanation of why achievement test scores were rising in the fifties and early sixties?

Effects of Schooling on Political and Social Knowledge and Attitudes

A few studies have attempted to ascertain the effects of the amount of schooling in general or the amount and kind of social studies instruction on student political and social knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

A recent major undertaking was the study by Hyman et al. (1975), entitled The Enduring Effects of Education. Hyman and his colleagues sought to respond to the critiques of education by Coleman, Jencks, and others, whose equally massive studies found the effects of schooling on various outcome measures to be minimal at best. Coleman's major question was whether variations in the resources of schools produced differences in students' cognitive knowledge while they were in school. Jencks was interested in the post-school effects of schooling, but his dependent measures referred to money and position rather than knowledge. Hyman et al. decided to examine the long-term (post-schooling) effects of amount of schooling on knowledge. While Coleman had found that variations in school resources had minimal effects on student knowledge and Jencks' had found that amount of schooling had little or no effect on adult earnings and status, Hyman et al. found that "education produces large, pervasive, and enduring effects on knowledge and receptivity to knowledge" (Hyman et al. 1975, p. 109).

Hyman and his colleagues' findings are of particular interest to social studies educators because almost all of his outcome measures focused on political and social knowledge. Hyman et al. re-analyzed data from 54 national surveys (from Gallup Poll, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, and Survey Research Center, University of Michigan), each of which was

> designed to approach the ideal of an unbiased sample of the adult population at large at the time of the original inquiry. In the aggregate, this yielded a pool of about 80,000 individuals on whom measurements of various relevant variables had already been obtained. All these surveys were conducted during 1949-71. (p. 4)

They examined results from these surveys at four points in time: early fifties, mid-fifties, early sixties, and late sixties. At least three levels of educational attainment--elementary school completed, high school graduation, college graduation--were examined in all cases. Also, four age groups were employed in the analysis: young adults (25-36), two intermediate age groups 37 to 48 and 49 to 60), and oldest adults (61-72). Controls were applied for sex, race, religion, immigration, social class origins, residential origins, and current social position. Three hundred discrete measures of knowledge and receptivity to knowledge from the 54 surveys were useable. Of the 250 knowledge items, 11 tested knowledge of popular culture; 140 tested knowledge of public affairs; 88 tested "academic" knowledge; and 11 tested knowledge of the duties and tools in four occupations (two indistrial and two white-collar).

The study produced consistent and strong results showing that the amount of schooling had positive effects on at least low-level cognitive knowledge, such as that measured by nationwide surveys. Whatever schooling's effects (or lack of effects) may be on short-term knowledge levels (as measured by cognitive tests while students are still in school) and on adult income and status, one cannot say schools have no positive effects at all, according to Hyman and his colleagues.

Whether one can attribute these positive effects to the social studies curriculum--the part of the curriculum that is generally considered to be most directly concerned with the kinds of knowledge predominantly measured in the surveys used by Hyman et al.--is another matter. Jennings and Levenson (1968), in a national survey of the political learning of a representative sample of 1,669 high school seniors, found that the number of civics courses taken had little or no effect on political knowledge and attitudes.

> An overview of the results offers strikingly little support for the impact of the curriculum. It is true that the direction for the findings generally agrees with the predictions advanced above. That is, the more civics courses the student has had the more likely he was to be knowledgeable, to be interested in politics, to expose himself to the political content on the mass media, to have more political discourse, to feel more efficacious, to espouse a participative (versus loyalty) orientation, and to show more civic tolerance. The possible exception to the pattern was the curvilinear relationship between course-taking and political cynicism. Thus, the claims made for the importance of the civic education courses in the senior high school are vindicated if one considers only the direction of the results.
>
> However, it is perfectly obvious from the size of the correlations that the magnitude of the relationships are extremely weak, in most instances bordering on the trivial . . . .
>
> While political interests tends to increase with an increase in the number of civics courses taken, the relationship is quite small. This and similar findings serve as evidence for the critics' contention that course taking among older adolescents results in only incremental changes in political orientations. Indeed, in all cases, the increments were so minuscule as to raise serious questions about the utility of investing in government courses in the senior high school, at least as these courses are presently constituted. (pp. 14-15)

Although, overall, civics course-taking appeared to have no effect on political knowledge and attitudes, in one instance the curriculum did appear to have some effect:

> When White and Negro students were observed separately, it became clear that the curriculum exerted considerably more influence on the latter. On several measures the effect was to move the Negro youths--especially those from less-educated families--to a position more congruent with the White youths and more in consonance with the usual goals of civic education in the United States. With respect to some quasi-participative measures, taking a civics course served to depress their performance, expecially those from better-educated families. In virtually all instances the Negro students were much more affected by taking such courses than were the Whites, regardless of whether the results were positive or negative.
>
> One explanation of the singular consequence of the curriculum upon Negro students is that information redundancy is lower for them than for White students. Because of cultural and social status differences, the Negro students are more likely to encounter new or conflicting perspectives and content. The more usual case for Whites is a further layering of familiar materials which, by and large, repeat the message from other past and contemporary sources. It is conceivable that other subpopulations of students are affected differently by the curriculum; that variations in content and pedagogy lead to varying outcomes; or that there will be delayed consequences from course exposure. (p. 18)

The last point--that it is conceivable there could be delayed consequences from course exposure--may be particularly important to consider in light of the findings of Hyman et al.

Jennings and Levenson's findings are consistent with previous studies' findings in regard to the effects of the social studies curriculum on political knowledge and attitudes. Patrick summarized these other studies:

> While not conclusive, several research studies have indicated that formal instructional programs in civic education have little or no impact upon political attitudes and values, that students are not moved very far toward attainment of the previously stated common objectives of instruction. Furthermore, high school civics and government courses appear to contribute only slightly to increased political knowledge and sophistication. (Patrick 1969, p. 15)

Very little investigation beyond that of Hyman et al., Jennings and Levenson, and other political socialization studies summarized by Patrick is available on the question of the effects of amount of schooling, particularly within the social studies curriculum, on short- and long-term social learning.

Summary Observations

1) The national testing programs, such as SAT and ITED, focus on knowledge and skills. Only a few of these programs yield social studies scores separate from scores in other subject areas.

2) Newer national and state testing programs, usually referred to as assessments, attempt to measure attitudinal as well as knowledge and skill outcomes. Often, the attitudinal material is covered under the heading of citizenship, although it sometimes is included in the portion of the assessment labeled social studies.

3) The assessment efforts have not yet produced trend data, as have the longer-lived national testing programs, nor have they been normed. Hence, it is quite difficult to interpret their results.

4) On the other hand, the national testing programs do not generally provide breakdowns within the social studies portions of their tests (e.g., social studies knowledge, skills, and attitudes; or knowledge of history, economics, and government)--when they have separate social studies segments at all--while the assessments do provide this more refined sort of data. Generally, the assessments provide breakdowns by various social studies and/or citizenship objectives that clusters of items were designed to measure.

5) In light of the difficulties of interpreting results of the national and state assessments, the following generalizations must be considered highly tentative:
    a) The skill area in which there appears to be the greatest deficiency [illegible] interpretation of maps, graphs, and tables. Although NAEP found satisfactory performance on information-seeking skills, such as identifying appropriate sources of information, some of the state assessment results indicate that there may be deficiencies in certain higher-level inquiry skills, such as identifying reliable and unreliable sources of information and making inferences. Also, NAEP findings indicate that students and young adults may not necessarily have mastery of basic citizenship skills, such as understanding how to use all parts of a simple ballot.

    b) The knowledge area appears to be the weakest for all age levels. Recall of factual information is difficult for all, not surprisingly; and group (such as SES, sex, age, region, income, type of community) differences tend to be most extreme on knowledge exercises. The areas of greatest deficiency in both the NAEP and state assessments appear to be geographical and economic knowledge. Respondents do somewhat better on historical and political knowledge. (It should be pointed out, however, that any political scientist would be apalled at some of the purportedly "basic" information that is not widely known throughout the assessment sample--for instance, only about half the respondents to the NAEP Bicentennial survey knew that the President could not appoint people to Congress. Historians would undoubtedly react similarly to the extent of historical knowledge.) One of the social sciences that is generally not distinguished in reports of results is anthropology; a cursory glance at results related to objectives such as "understanding cultural variation" hints that there may be deficiencies in anthropology, too.

c) It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to summarize briefly and meaningfully the findings in regard to attitudes, generally measured in citizenship assessments. The results of NAEP's assessment, which seem to be supported by state assessments, are indicated very roughly below:

Show concern for well-being of others: Respondents showed high support for this objective.

Support rights and freedoms of all individuals: Respondents showed high support in principle, but there was a decrease in support in specific application

Recognize the value of just law: High support.

Know the main structure and functions of government: Respondents demonstrated fair performance on this objective.

Participate in effective civil action: Rather low performance.

Understand problems of international relations: Respondents had high awareness of such problems.

Approach civic decisions rationally: High awareness of societal problems; recognition of need to approach them rationally improves with age, to a fairly high level.

Take responsibility for own development: Fair performance.

Help and respect own families: High performance.

6) The well-known decline in achievement test scores during the last decade appears to be most marked in the social studies. Although there has been much examination of possible reasons for the declines in general, no attention has been given to possible explanations for social studies declines in particular.

7) The national and state assessments and testing programs are generally not designed to enable one to attribute findings in regard to knowledge, attitude, and skill outcomes specifically to school influences (although the presumption is strong that those tests measuring "formal" or "academic" knowledge are detecting school, and not family or other environmental, influences). There has not been a great deal of research aimed at linking the kinds of social studies outcomes measured by such assessments and tests to amount and kind of schooling; there has been even less research on the influences, if any, of the amount and kind of social studies instruction on such summative measures of schooling's outcomes. Studies that do exist and focus specifically on social and political knowledge, skills, and attitudes generally indicate that schooling and social studies instruction have little effect. One notable exception is described in this subsection.

2.9 Research on Effectiveness of Social Studies Teacher Education

This subsection reviews research on the effectiveness of various approaches to teacher education in the social studies. After an overview of the quantity and quality of research in this area, we examine findings in regard to training in instructional methods, training in subject matter, training combining instructional methods and subject matter, and the influence of trainee characteristics on the effectiveness of various training approaches. Finally, to give perspective to the findings related specifically to social studies, we review findings from the broader teacher education literature.

Sources

This section is based on material found in the comprehensive reviews of research in social studies education, the three compilations of dissertations in the field, three special-focus reviews on teacher education in social studies (Fair 1965; Grannis 1970; and Rosenshine 1972), and one review of general teacher education research (Peck and Tucker 1973). One other special-focus review on social studies teacher education (Weintraub 1970) was consulted but not used.

Documentation and Discussion

Overview: Quantity and Quality of Research on Social Studies Teacher Education

Amount of Teacher Education Research in Social Studies. Fair's 1965 review was the first special-focus review of research on teacher education in social studies. Fair claimed that research on social studies teacher education was quite sparse, a finding that tallies with a count of the number of teacher education studies reported by comprehensive reviewers. The picture appears to have changed around 1970, however. The reviews by Rosenshine (1972), Grannis (1970), and Tucker (1977) indicated that, by that time, interest in research in this area had greatly increased. Chapin observed, in her 1974 compilation of dissertations in the social studies, that the most popular topic of social studies dissertations done from 1969 through March 1973 was "teachers and teacher education." A total of 63 dissertations on teachers and teacher education were listed by Chapin, while the previous dissertation compilation (Gross and De La Cruz 1971), covering the period 1963-1969, listed only 33 (not counting those duplicating the listings in Chapin), and the earliest compilation (McPhie 1964) listed only 19 done in the period 1955-1962.

Almost all of the studies on social studies teacher education prior to 1967 dealt with preservice training. Only one study mentioned in the comprehensive reviews before that year dealt with inservice training. Grannis (1970) gave the first strong plea for attention to inservice training found in a review of research. He urged that we view the problems of teacher education "as a matter of the continuous development and renewal of the teacher and his school" (p. 300). He suggested not only attention to inservice education of individual teachers, but also attention to the school setting within which the teacher operated. The research he reviewed suggested that, without ongoing attention to the growth of teachers within the full school setting, any changes achieved by inservice training were likely to revert rapidly to the status quo ante.

Quality of Teacher Education Research in Social Studies. Fair (1965) centered her review of research in social studies teacher education on the need to produce more specific, systematic descriptions of teacher behavior. She devoted her review almost exclusively to "new devices--conceptual, methodological, and technological--for obtaining more objective and concrete descriptions of teacher behavior in classroom situations" (p. 15). She described studies involving the Flanders Interaction Analysis System, Smith and Meux's analysis system based on logical operations, the Aschner-Gallagher Category System, videotaping methods, OScAR, and so forth. She did not, however present the conclusions from the studies reviewed. She stressed the usefulness of such observational tools not only for research but also for preservice and inservice training of teachers.

Payette, Cox, and Johnson (1970) noted that the studies on teacher education and teaching during 1969 had displayed an attempt to become more specific and descriptive about actual classroom behavior of teachers. Apparently Fair's suggestion was beginning to take hold.

However, Rosenshine's review (1972), originally presented in 1970, indicated that teacher education research not only in the social studies but in other areas, too, was far from achieving the ideal as yet. Rosenshine found only 15 studies that met his three criteria of sound research on teacher education: that they include the training of teachers in specified classroom behaviors; that they make use of observations to verify that those behaviors actually occurred in the experimental classrooms; and that they employ end-of-experiment measures of student performance to determine if changed teacher behavior affects student learning.

The most recent reviewer (Tucker 1977) noted an apparent "infirmity" in the field of social studies teacher education. He attributed this infirmity partially to the lack of a cumulative research base and suggested that at least two things should be considered in building a more solid research base for social studies teacher education.

First, research on teacher education should be connected to research on effective teaching. Tucker argued that one cannot know whether teacher education had been successful without first having a conception of what constitutes successful teaching. The tendency in the past had been to deal with research on teacher education separately from research on classroom teaching. It was time to examine the links among three sets of variables: teacher education variables, teaching behavior in the classroom, and student outcomes. (This echoed Rosenshine's argument that student outcomes were the ultimate test of the success of a teacher training effort.)

Second, conceptions of successful teaching in the social studies varied with definitions of conceptions of what social studies is/are. One of the first steps in clarifying the criteria of successful teaching, according to Tucker, would be to clarify definitions of social studies. Tucker cited three definitions, which he saw as dominant among reform movements in the social studies: social studies as academic disciplines, social studies as personal development, and social studies as social issues. According to Tucker, the academic disciplines definition had generated the least amount of research on teaching and teacher education; the personal-development definition had generated some research, primarily on values education; and the social-issues approach had generated the bulk of research on teaching and teacher education.

Tucker suggested that one way to proceed would be to examine the degree to which the aims, values, and assumptions of each of the three definitions were incorporated into particular teacher education programs; then explore the effects of those programs on teacher behavior and student outcomes.

Findings of Research on Social Studies Teacher Education

Training in Instructional Methods. In 1970, Rosenshine (1972) reported to the National Council for the Social Studies on a review of research studies on teacher education. He had sifted the literature in order to identify studies involving three elements: training of teachers in specified classroom behaviors; observations to verify that those behaviors actually occurred in the exmperimental classrooms; and end-of-experiment measures of student performance.

Only studies that contained these three elements could illuminate the full range of variables of interest in establishing the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of teacher training approaches and procedures. Although he did not limit himself to examination of only social studies research, he found only 15 studies meeting his criteria.

Six involved teacher use of specific cognitive behaviors, such as asking questions that required increased cognitive processing to answer. In all six, there was good evidence that training modified teacher behavior in the desired direction and that student classroom behavior became modified to fit the desired model. However, in all but one of the studies, there were no significant differences between experimental and control students on the achievement measures at the end of instruction--a disconcerting outcome, to say the least!

Four studies involved teacher use of specific affective behaviors. In all of these, the teachers changed thier behavior in the desired direction as a result of training, but there were no significant differences on student achievement measures.

Two studies involved increasing student participation during class. Neither provided support for the value of student participation, confirming what correlational studies have found. (Rosenshine goes on to suggest, "The success of Sesame Street must be a paradox to those who believe that student participation is all important." p. 300)

Finally, three studies on teacher enthusiasm were among the 15. Unlike the other studies, all three showed significant differences in favor of enthusiastic presentation of material to students. However, the contrasting conditions used were far from normal; the nonenthusiastic teachers presented the material with indifference or in a monotone.

Only one other research reviewer besides Rosenshine commented on research on the effectiveness of methods training. Tucker (1977) examined research on competency-based teacher education (CBTE). He noted that the bulk of this research had not focused on social studies and that this might be a major shortcoming of the CBTE research. CBTE researchers had largely ignored the strong possibility that there might be differences in what constituted competencies of successful teaching from one subject-matter field to the next. Tucker argued that, in order to specify what constitutes successful teaching in the social studies, one must first define the social studies. It follows, then, that specification of teaching competencies in social studies depend on how one conceives the field. Until recently, CBTE researchers have tended to view competencies as being the same, no matter what the subject matter being taught; and CBTE research seems to have had little relevance to the problems of social studies teaching and teacher education, as a result.

In addition to his commentary on CBTE research, Tucker also reported one positive and significant finding of research on methods training. He noted that the research literature "overwhelmingly" showed that teachers could be trained to acquire inquiry-oriented behaviors and dispositions. However, he did not take this further to show that such teacher behavior produced inquiry behavior by students.

No other reviewers, comprehensive or special focus, offered commentary or interpretation of research on the effectiveness of training in social studies instructional methods.

Training in Subject Matter. A dominant theme in the comprehensive reviews during the sixties was the poor content preparation of social studies teachers. For instance, Skretting and Lundeen (1969) pointed out that several studies had indicated that secondary social studies teachers were not well prepared in the social sciences. This emphasis on the need for better subject-matter preparation of social studies teachers appears to have corresponded with the rise and heyday of the "new social studies" movement, which heavily emphasized the social science disciplines. Tucker (1977) suggested that the academic-disciplines definition of the social studies--which was at the heart of the "new social studies"--assumed that solid teacher academic background was one of the most important variables in successful teaching, rather than taking this as a research question.

By the late sixties, however, some researchers were examining this assumption.* Johnson, Payette, and Cox (1969) reviewed a batch of studies that appeared in 1968 (eleven, to be exact) and focused on the subject-matter preparation of social studies teachers. Seven of these were of the survey variety, simply reporting the amount of preparation in various kinds of content (e.g., communism, civics) that teachers in various states had. Four sought to establish relationships between subject-matter preparation and either teacher knowledge or pupil achievement. The surveys generally reported that subject-matter preparation was "inadequate," with the criterion of adequacy not being mentioned in the review. Two studies went farther, however, and found that there was no relationship between formal subject-matter preparation and teacher knowledge of the subject matter! And two more studies sought to connect the telling outcome variable--student learning--with teacher subject-matter preparation. Neither found any correlation between the two! (It should be noted that the latter two studies both were done by researchers attached to "new social studies" projects and, thus, came out of the academic-disciplines perspective. Although these studies appeared late in the "new social studies" movement, they do show that the academic-disciplines school of thought was not entirely oblivious to the "researchability" of its assumptions, as Tucker implied.)

---

*Actually, at least one earlier study had explored the question of the relationships between teaching success and academic preparation. Ellis (1961) examined the academic backgrounds of 70 secondary teachers, rated as outstanding or average/below average. He found that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups of teachers in terms of the pattern, quantity, and quality of their academic preparation.

Grannis (1970) also examined, at some length, the question of whether teacher subject-matter preparation made any difference. He pointed out that a number of studies over the previous 30 years had focused on this question and that they had shown there was little or no connection between teacher subject-matter preparation and pupil achievement at the elementary level and, at the secondary level, there was only a connection in the case of bright students in certain subject areas (advanced math, chemistry, and physics). Grannis pointed out that the measures of student achievement used in most of these studies were limited to mastery of information and lower-level skills; they tapped very little in the way of reasoning and judgment. (It should be noted that this was true of at least one of the two latter studies mentioned in the previous paragraph, too.) Grannis commented,

> A mountain of evidence . . . indicates that where learning of this sort is at stake, virtually nothing outside of pupils' capacaties and access to information, together with the expectations teachers or other have for their learning, makes a difference in pupils' achievement. (p. 292)

Grannis drew hints from a couple of other studies that the main function of knowledge of subject matter was to sanction the teacher's role as an authority, a giver of knowledge.

Tucker (1977) is the only other reviewer to comment on research on subject-matter preparation of social studies teachers. He reported that the University of Georgia Curriculum Project's several studies have indicated that special teacher training programs did not significantly affect lower-level cognitive performance of students; however, results from other research on this question were quite mixed.

No other comprehensive or special-focus reviewers offered insights about the effectiveness of training in academic content.

Training Combining Methods and Subject Matter. Two reviewers offered brief observations on research on the effectiveness of training models that combined methods and subject matter. Grannis (1970) looked at three studies on the training of secondary social studies teachers in inquiry methods. These suggested that training in inquiry methods together with subject-matter training produced changes in student inquiry behavior, but that training in subject matter alone or in methods alone did not. Tucker (1977) cited nine studies that measured the impact of special training in selected discipline-centered project materials on teacher knowledge, skills, and attitudes. All reported favorable results. However, Tucker cautioned that it was hazardous to draw generalizations for teacher education practice from these because they varied so widely in design and quality.

Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Training. There has been very little research on the possible relationships between teacher-trainee characteristics (for instance, dogmatism or belief systems) and the effectiveness of various teacher training models. Tucker (1977) argued that the evidence that teacher beliefs are important variables in social studies teacher behavior was mounting. His commentary suggested further that teacher-trainee beliefs had important effects on receptivity to learning different models of teaching. He cited the research on models of teaching at Columbia Teachers College. It suggested that "any particular model of teaching is more than a mere technique or style that can be learned apart from its underlying assumptions and beliefs" (p. 121). A teacher's beliefs limit the kinds of competencies that he/she can be expected to develop; teacher-trainees may resist models that are based on perspectives that are at odds with their own.

Although some other reviewers reported on status studies of teacher characteristics and/or on studies of relationships between teacher characteristics and student learning, none besides Tucker examined the relationships between teacher characteristics and training effectiveness.

Generalizations about Teacher Training from the Broader Teacher Education Literature. The findings from research on social studies teacher education reported in the few preceding pages reflect a field of endeavor that is still only in a fledgling stage of development. Peck and Tucker (1973), in the most recent edition of AERA's Handbook of Research on Teaching, indicated that the broader field of teacher education research in general was not much ahead of social studies. Apparently, research on teacher education has only recently "gotten off the ground"; they state that

> It is our strong impression that a quantum leap occurred, somewhere between 1963 and 1965, in the quality of both the design and the reporting of research in this field. (p. 941)

They speculate that the most likely cause of this increase in research on teacher education was the influx of federal monies for research and graduate training in education.

In order to give the reader some perspective on the comparative state of development of social studies teacher education research and teacher education research in general, we have reproduced here the generalizations that Peck and Tucker felt they could draw from the broader research literature. They stated that these were "themes which seem to emerge from this recent, but growing, body of research" (p. 943).

> 1. A "systems" approach to teacher education, often called "instructional design," substantially improves its effectiveness. There are a number of studies illustrating that this works equally well to induce desirable teaching behavior in cognitive and in affective respects. A good deal of research is clustered around three special cases of this general model: training teachers in interaction analysis, microteaching, and behavior modification.
>
> 2. Teacher educators should practice what they preach. When teachers are treated in the same way they are supposed to treat their pupils, they are more likely to adopt the desired style of teaching behavior.
>
> 3. Direct involvement in the role to be learned, or such close approximations as sensitivity-training laboratories or classroom simulation laboratories, produce the desired teaching behavior more effectively than remote or abstract experiences such as lectures on instructional theory.

4. Using any or all of the techniques just mentioned, it is possible to induce a more self-initiated, self-directed, effective pattern of learning, not only in teachers but, through them, in their pupils.

5. Traditional ways of educating teachers have some of the intended effects, but they also have some quite undesired effects.

6. The training of teachers of teachers is a current concern at numerous places in the United States. At this point in time there is no empirical research whatever on this aspect of teacher education. Some would seem indicated. (In fact, there is no discernible research on training for college teaching in any field.)

7. One long-needed methodological advance is beginning to appear in the research: the use of pupil-gain measures as the ultimate criteria of the effectiveness of any given process of teacher education. These include affective and behavioral gains as well as gains in subject mastery.

Summary Observations

1) Social studies teacher education, like teacher education in general, has become an important research interest only within the last decade.

2) The major qualitative criticisms of research on social studies teacher education have been:

   a) that it has not been based on a clear conception of what constitutes successful teaching of the social studies;

   b) that it has not usually employed observations to assure that the training behaviors are reproduced in classroom practice; and

   c) that it has not usually employed measures of student outcomes as the ultimate test of whether teacher training has been successful.

3) Cumulative findings from research on social studies teacher education--at least as they are reflected in the reviews of research--are few, although some emerging lines of research may be on the verge of producing results.

4) Some studies have indicated that, although training in instructional methods can produce specified changes in teacher behavior, the teacher behaviors may not produce changes in student outcomes.

5) Although many have assumed that increases in teacher subject-matter preparation would produce increased student learning in the classroom, most studies of the question have shown that this is not the case, at least for lower-cognitive levels of student learning. Measures of higher-cognitive-level learning have apparently been used only rarely in such studies.

6) A few studies have indicated that training combining teacher instruction in the content of the academic disciplines with training in the methods of teaching such content may produce desired changes in student learning.

7) There has been very little research on the possible realtionships between teacher characteristics (e.g., teacher dogmatism, teacher beliefs) and various types of training in the social studies. There has been some research on some characteristics that has suggested possible relationships that need further exploration. For instance. there are some good indications that certain teacher characteristics, such as beliefs, may cause trainees to resist learning of certain instructional approaches. The interplay of many other teacher characteristics with various training modes is yet to be explored.

Section 3.0

NEEDS IN SOCIAL STUDIES/SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

This section of the report is organized somewhat differently from the previous two sections. It is not subdivided into a series of numbered subsections, each with its own set of summary observations. Instead, this entire section should be viewed as a whole.

The section opens with a discussion of a special problem--sometimes thought of as unique to the social studies--that makes the identification of needs in the field particularly difficult. It then goes on to describe the perceptions of needs in social studies from three distinct groups that have influenced or attempted to influence the shape of the field over the past 20 years: professional social studies educators, social scientists, and laypersons.

Sources

Every document on the social studies written from 1955 to 1975 could have been employed in developing this section, since all contain implicit or explicit notions about needs in the field. However, in order to make the task in this section manageable, we have limited ourselves to a few key sources. We have used official position statements from the National Council for the Social Studies as one primary indicator of the views of social studies education professionals on needs in social studies. The second major source for this group's views is the Council's journal, Social Education. As a check on the validity of these two sources, we examined several other journals, such as The Social Studies, and the listings in Education Index and found that the ideas presented elsewhere essentially ran parallel to those presented in Social Education. The major source for views of social scientists, a second major group influencing the social studies, consisted of the few official position statements issued by social science learned societies. Also, various monographs, books, and journals containing information about social scientists' perceptions of needs in social studies were consulted. Finally, a variety of sources were examined to obtain a picture of the needs perceptions of laypersons, the third category of influential participants in shaping the social studies curriculum. Primarily, these sources consisted of a few books and articles that are generally considered to have exerted significant influence on the thinking of social studies educators over the last two decades.

Documentation and Discussion

It is virtually impossible to review all the literature on needs in social studies/social science education, since nearly everything written in the field contains some explicit statement of recommendations and what remains contains implicit notions about needs. Thus, what follows is not a detailed list of the numerous needs that have been expressed at one time or another in regard to social studies.

Such a list is not only close to impossible to develop; it would not be very informative and, in fact, would probably be misleading. It would not be very informative in that it would show that social studies educators and others interested in the social studies have wanted, or thought they needed, just about everything at one time or another. It would be misleading in that it might give the impression that social studies educators and others concerned with social studies are actually able to state specific needs with a degree of precision.

There seems to be a rather pervasive problem in social studies/social science education that gets in the way of developing a clear, consensually based picture of what is needed in the field. This is the problem of definition--of delineating the purposes, scope, and sequence of the field. The social studies seems to have undergone a continuous identity crisis during the past 20 years, and perhaps longer. Thus, it is really rather difficult to speak of "needs" in the field, for it is difficult to see what one's needs are until one has some notion of the goals.

Thus, in this section we shall speak more of "concerns" than of "needs," of things that worry the profession and other interested parties, of questions that seem to need answers, of issues that are hotly or calmly debated. Where possible, we shall cite specific statements of needs, positions, or standards that have been produced by organized groups representing sizeable portions of the profession or important external groups. For instance, we have discussed at some length the various official position statements issued by NCSS on behalf of the profession and we have included in the appendix summaries of position statements issued by some social science professional organizations. However, it should be kept in mind that these recommendations tend to reflect only partial viewpoints and there are many significant voices who would argue against them.

Finally, we have not discussed here the research or other informational needs of social studies. We have assumed that what needs to be done in the way of surveying the state of practices or research on the effectiveness of social studies/social science education will become apparent as one reads through sections 1.0 and 2.0. Two additional sources on research needs might be consulted, if NSF is interested in this area: Needed Research in the Teaching of the Social Studies (Price 1963) and the most recent review of research in the social studies (Hunkins et al. 1977).

Viewpoints of the Profession: Official NCSS Position Statements

Official position statements issued by the National Council for the Social Studies reflect those areas in which the social studies education profession--at least that part of it which is professionally active enough to belong to NCSS--has been able to develop a fairly high degree of concensus. The process through which such statements are developed and approved requires input and agreement from diverse viewpoints within the profession. There have been four areas in which NCSS has issued periodic position statements over the past 20 years: academic freedom, social studies curriculum content, the role of social studies within the larger curriculum, and standards for social studies teachers. Each of these is described briefly below.

Academic Freedom. Since 1955, the Council has issued six position statements on academic freedom in the social studies (Committee on Academic Freedom 1956; Academic Freedom 1967; Academic Freedom . . . 1967; Academic Freedon . . . 1971; National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement on the Freedom to Teacher and the Freedom to Learn 1975; and National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities 1975). The basic concern running through all the statements except the last, which focuses on students rather than teachers, is to assure protection of teachers against administrative and community pressure in the handling of controversial topics in the social studies classroom. The social studies education profession has long felt itself to be more susceptible than teachers in most other curriculum areas to such pressure, since the nature of social studies subject matter is inherently more controversial than that of most other areas.

One can trace some evolution within these statements over the 20-year period, even though the basic concern for protection of teachers in dealing with controversial subjects remains the same. The 1956 statement bears some clear scars from the McCarthy era--for instance, it mentions the problem of "disloyal persons." The 1967 statement mentioned first above, originally issued in 1964, does not mention disloyalty, but it does reflect a residue of bitterness from the earlier era in that it seems unwilling to recognize that criticism of social studies teaching can stem from legitimate concerns in the community. It speaks of "irresponsible and malicious charges" and the like. The second 1967 statement, however, shows a clear recognition that criticism may well be legitimate. This recognition remains throughout the subsequent statements.

Another evolutionary thread is seen in the increasing number of objects of concern dealt with under the label of academic freedom. The first statement, in 1956, focused only on attacks against teachers. The 1964 statement included both teachers and textbook authors. The 1967 statement focused on complaints about social studies materials. The 1971 statement dealt with teachers, materials, curriculum and content, and visiting speakers. And one of the two 1975 statements widened the range of concerns even farther, devoting extensive attention to the rights and responsibilities of students. (This last statement traced its origins back to the Tinker decision of 1969.

Social Studies Curriculum Content While there seems to have been a relatively high degree of consensus on the matter of academic freedom over the 20-year period from 1955 to 1975, the same cannot be said for questions of goals and content in the social studies. The section below on definitions of the social studies reflects the continuing heated debate over this issue. Nevertheless, NCSS has been able from time to time to find enough agreement to issue official position statements recommending goals and content for the social studies curriculum. There have been six such statements during the 20-year period (McCutchen 1956; A Guide to Content . . . 1957; The Role of the Social Studies 1962; Fraser and McCutchen 1965; Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines 1971; and Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education 1976). The evolution of the Council's recommendations about what should be included in the social studies curriculum can clearly be seen in a listing of the themes or goals presented in three of these documents (the 1957, 1965, and 1971 documents).

In 1957, 14 themes, or goals of social studies instruction, were suggested, as follows:

1) the intelligent uses of the forces of nature
2) recognition and understanding of world interdependence
3) recognition of the dignity and worth of the individual
4) the use of intelligence to improve human living
5) the vitalization of our democracy through an intelligent use of our public educational facilities
6) the intelligent acceptance, by individuals and groups, of responsibility for achieving democratic social action
7) increasing the effectiveness of the family as a basic social institution
8) the effective development of moral and spiritual values
9) the intelligent and responsible sharing of power in order to attain justice
10) the intelligent utilization of scarce resources to attain the widest general well being
11) achievement of adequate horizons of loyalty
12) cooperation in the interest of peace and welfare
13) achieving a balance between social stability and social change
14) widening and deepening the ability to live more richly

The 1965 document relected only marginal changes in this set of themes. One new theme was added to the list:

the understanding of the major world cultures and culture areas

And Theme 1 from the 1957 list was reworded to read:

the intelligent uses of the natural environment

The remaining 13 themes were exactly the same as in the 1957 statement.

A radical change occurred somewhere between 1965 and 1971, for the Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines issued in 1971 after a lengthy period of discussion within NCSS showed little resemblance to the earlier statements. One of the most notable differences between the 1971 and the earlier documents is that the 1971 statement deals not only with curriculum content, but instructional methods, evaluation, and the like. An outline of the guidelines is presented below.(A more detailed outline is included in the Appendix):

1.0 The Social Studies Program Should be Directly Related to the Concerns of Students.

2.0 The Social Studies Program Should Deal with the Real Social World.

3.0 The Social Studies Program Should Draw from Currently Valid Knowledge Representative of Man's Experience, Culture, and Beliefs.

4.0 Objectives Should be Thoughtfully Selected and Clearly Stated in Such Form as to Furnish Direction to the Program.

5.0 Learning Activities Should Engage the Student Directly and Actively in the Learning Process.

6.0 Strategies of Instruction and Learning Activities Should Rely on a Broad Range of Learning Resources.

7.0 The Social Studies Program Must Facilitate the Organization of Experience.

8.0 Evaluation Should be Useful, Systematic, Comprehensive, and Valid for the Objectives of the Program.

9.0 Social Studies Education Should Recieve Vigorous Support as a Vital and Responsible Part of the School Program.

Role of the Social Studies in the Larger Curriculum. Two official NCSS statements regarding the place of social studies in comparison with other curricular areas--specifically science, mathematics, and foreign languages--appeared in the pages of *Social Education* in the immediate post-Sputnik era. The first was a resolution passed by NCSS at its annual meeting in 1957, right after the USSR's surprise launching. Note that the term social science is used rather than social studies.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES
NOVEMBER 29, 1957

The American people are confronted today with the grave issue of the survival of our civilization, and possibly of mankind itself. To meet this challenge, many proposals are being advanced for altering the content of American education. Most of these proposals suggest an increased emphasis on the natural sciences and on mathematics.

The NCSS is in agreement with this position. However, science and mathematics themselves, important as they are, cannot provide solutions to many of the grave problems that we fact today. The most serious issues of our time lie within the field of human affairs. For the solutions to these problems, we must look to the social sciences and to the humanities.

The present crisis demands that we strengthen every aspect of American education--the natural sciences and mathematics, the social sciences, and the humanities. The ideals and aspirations of a free society and its democratic institutions depend upon an educational program that is concerned with the entire breadth and depth of human experience. To this all-important objective, the social sciences can make a great and distinctive contribution.

Therefore, the NCSS urges that, in the current crisis confronting our country, sustained and vigorous attention must be given to the fundamental role of the social sciences in the education of American Youth.

The second official statement appeared in 1961 and incorporated the points made in numerous resolutions passed by the NCSS House of Delegates in intervening years since 1957. This was the testimony given by Merrill F. Hartshorn, Executive Secretary of NCSS, before the hearings on the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) revision. Hartshorn reiterated the second paragraph of the 1957 resolution and argued that it was imperative to maintain balance in the school curriculum. The original NDEA tended to contribute to an imbalance, but in the revision of the Act, the balance could be restored if social studies were included among the areas to be funded. He argued further that

> It must be obvious that man's conquest of nature will become meaningless, even less than meaningless, unless he first of all learns to conquer himself and learns to live with his fellow man in a just and decent world. (p. 296)

This was the task to which social studies addressed itself. More specifically, Hartshorn recommended that, under Title III of NDEA, funds should be made available for the purchase of social studies teaching aids such as maps, globes, and atlases and for providing more state supervisory personnel in the social studies. He recommended that Title VI be broadened to include institutes for teachers of history, geography, economics, government, and sociology.

Teacher Standards in Social Studies. The fourth and final area in which a number of position statements have been formulated by NCSS is that of standards for teachers in the social studies. This is apparently a relatively new area of concern--or at least a relatively new area in which it has been possible to achieve some degree of consensus about professional concerns--since the first official statement did not appear until 1964. Four documents related to teacher standards were located in Social Education (The Code of Ethics . . . 1964; Statement of Teaching Preparation . . . 1965; Guidelines for the Preparation . . . 1967; and Standards for Social Studies Teachers 1971).

The first document, the code of ethics, need not be discussed in detail here. It was originally formulated and adopted by the National Education Association and subsequently endorsed by the NCSS Board of Directors.

The other three documents show a progressive elaboration of the Council's concerns and recommendations in regard to social studies teacher preparation and working conditions. The first (1965) merely presents brief statements in regard to teaching assignments: that they should be in the teacher's major field of preparation, that they should be for no more than five classes and 125 students, and they they should allow for one preparation period per day.

The second document (1967) outlines recommended requirements for social studies teacher preparation. Among the recommendations are the following:

1) that preservice education should be distributed among general education courses (25-30 percent of total courses); professional education (15-25 percent); and academic teaching fields (50-60 percent).

2) that secondary preparation should include broad preparation in the social sciences, such as anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, and sociology, and depth in one field.

3) that elementary teachers should have broad background in the social sciences with some depth work relevant to the areas in which they will be teaching.

4) that classroom teachers should engage in graduate programs involving both their subject area speciality and professional education courses.

The 1971 document shows the extent of work that had gone on in the years since the 1967 statement. It is a much lengthier statement and deals not only with teacher preparation standards but also work activities and conditions of social studies teachers. It adheres essentially to the 1967 recommendations in regard to teacher preparation, but elaborates on them and spells out some new recommendations, such as immersion in another culture as essential to preparation of social studies teachers. The 1971 standards also recommend a three-step screening process during preservice education and suggest criteria to be applied at each screening stage. It reiterates the 1965 recommendation, with more elaboration, that social studies teachers only be assigned to teach in their field of major preparation and argues that "No one teaching any social studies class should be employed just to accommodate the special needs of other departments or facets of the school programs" (p. 849). It recommends standards for teacher-student interaction, for the teacher in the role of planner, and for teacher-community interaction. Also included are standards related to secure employment conditions, academic freedom, class load and class size, extracurricular duties, and the instructional environment (including materials and equipment). Finally, it makes recommendations in regard to professional development and the teacher's activities within the organized profession.

Viewpoints of the Profession: Social Education and Other Sources

While the official position statements of NCSS show at least some areas in which there appears to be some consensus on needs and concerns within the social studies education profession, the journal of NCSS, Social Education, shows the substantial diversity of opinion within the profession on these same and other questions. Below we discuss what is perhaps a central element in the continuance of this diversity, the lack of agreement on a definition of the social studies, and then attempt to summarize the variety of concerns relfected in the pages of Social Education over the past 20 years. Although Social Education is our core resource, we have also referred to other professional sources as appropriate for giving a rounded view.

Definition of the Social Studies. It has been argued that the greatest need in the social studies is to define the field (McCutcheon 1963; Ploghoft 1965; Shaver 1967, 1977; and Barth and Shermis 1970, among others). It has also been argued, quite a bit less vociferously, that the profession should not worry about establishing a consensus on the definition of the field (Robinson 1963; Becker 1965).

Although there has never been consensus about definition, there appeared to be a lull in the debate at the beginning of the 20-year period with which we are concerned. From 1955 to 1959, the pages of Social Education were filled with articles focusing primarily on the content and teaching of history, on discussions of citizenship education, and the like. Although the generally accepted one-line definition of social studies given at that time was Edgar Wesley's statement, "The social studies are the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes," there did not appear to be much conscious thought about social sciences other than history and geography or about any possible contradictions between social-studies-as-social-science versus social-studies-as-citizenship-education (just to cite two alternative definitions, probably the dominant ones).

The first clearly discernible marks of what was to become probably THE major debate of the last 20 years in the social studies appeared in Stanley Wronski's 1959 article arguing for a focus on how the social scientist inquires and Shirley Engle's oft-cited article of 1960, in which he proposed social studies should be education for decision making. Subsequently, numerous articles presenting various positions on definition and redefinition have appeared. The two major "camps" in this debate appear to have been (1) social studies as social science and (2) social studies as citizenship education. Arguments for the former have included Wronski 1959, Berelson 1962, Morrissett 1967, and Morrissett and Stevens 1971. (The last three, by the way, appeared outside the pages of Social Education. This should not be taken to indicate that NCSS was antagonistic to the social science position. The Berelson volume was cosponsored by NCSS and numerous articles presenting the social science viewpoint appeared in Social Education during the debate over the "new social studies" in the sixties. The latter articles are referred to in Section 4.0, on the "new social studies.") The arguments for the citizenship camp were most forcefully presented by Engle (1960), McCutcheon (1963), Shaver (1967), Newmann (1976), and Shaver (1977).

Lest the reader be misled in to thinking that the debate is a simple one between only two camps, we should mention here that, although the two positions mentioned above appear to be the dominant alternatives, other alternatives have frequently been advocated, often in combination with one of the two mentioned above. Both the Barth and Shermis (1970) scheme of definitions and the Brubaker et al. (1977) scheme have been outlined previously in this report. However, they bear repeating here. Barth and Shermis suggested that there have been three compteing traditions, conceptually distinct from one another and prescribing three different modes of selection and organization of content and teaching:

1) social studies as citizenship transmission;
2) social studies as social science; and
3) social studies as reflective inquiry.

Brubaker et al. more recently suggested a "five-camp model" for analyzing social studies curriculum and instruction:

1) social studies as knowledge of the past as a guide to good citizenship;
2) social studies in the student-centered tradition;
3) social studies as reflective inquiry;

4) social studies as structure of the disciplines; and

5) social studies as socio-political involvement.

Finally, it should be noted that none of the advocates of either of the two dominant positions have seen themselves as totally excluding the goals advocated by the other position. The social science proponents always (or almost always) saw themselves as citizenship educators as well as social science educators; they argued that education in the social sciences was necessary to enlighten citizenship in an age of rapid, science-based change. The citizenship proponents, on the other hand, always saw a substantial role for social science instruction within citizenship education. Early in the debate, Berelson (1962) suggested that the either/or dichotomy was a false issue. He claimed that most contenders would agree that the aim is "to give high school students the best introduction to the social science disciplines *as a means to the end* [Berelson's italics] of producing responsible citizens" (pp. 6-7). However, apparently the parties to the debate do not agree, for the debate has continued unabated for the last 15 years.

The pertinence of the debate over what the social studies is/are to this section on needs should be apparent: we hypothesize that at least one major reason why social studies educators and others are not very clear about what the needs in social studies are is that they are not clear about what the purposes and boundaries of the "field" are.

Other Concerns. A wide variety of concerns other than definitional are stated in *Social Education* and other professional documents during the 20-year period under consideration. It would be impossible to give a complete list of these, but it is not impossible to give some indication of the flavor and variety. One good starting point would be a study, reported in *Social Education* by Ediger in 1964, of the concerns in regard to elementary social studies instruction as reflected in all educational journals listed in *Education Index* from 1953 to 1963. The following "threads," on which most of the writers of articles seemed to agree, were mentioned most frequently during that period:

1) Elementary children need to be given more opportunities for developing better human relationships within the school environment. This could contribute to good citizenship, by emphasizing democratic living.

2) Critical thinking abilities need to be encouraged in children, through development of discriminating reading skills and opportunities to constructively criticize each other's ideas in the school situation.

3) Opportunities for practice in problem solving should be provided, instead of strictly following a textbook.

4) Emphasis should be placed on generalizations arrived at through problem solving, not on memorization of facts.

5) There is need to improve the evaluation process to evaluate the total growth of the child, not simply measure factual learning.

6) There should be cooperative planning by all involved in a child's education, K-12, in order to provide for continuity.

7) Since science and technology have increased the interdependence of the world, we need to spend more time developing children's world understandings, their understanding of the United States' leadership role, and their understanding of their future adult roles in the world.

In addition to these concerns, the pages of Social Education during the late fifties and early sixties showed a rather heavy interest in teaching about communism and dealing with other controversial issues in the classroom. This came, no doubt, from the pressures of the McCarthy era. (See, for instance, the April 1958 and February 1964 issues of Social Education, both devoted to articles on teaching about the USSR and communism. Also see McCreary 1962 and Lunstrum 1962.) Also, for a few years following the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision, there appeared an occasional article on desegregation in the schools and how it affected the teaching of the social studies. However, the desegregation concern was not nearly so visible as the communism concern.

The dominant concern up until about 1960 appeared to be with the content and methods of teaching History. Although there were articles focusing on other social science fields, it seemed very clear that the pervasive interests of the writers and readers of Social Education in the early period lay within the area of history instruction.

In the early sixties, this pattern shifted quite noticeably, with the onslaught of the "new social studies." Curriculum revision in the social studies became the theme. The revisionist mood had been building for some time. In the fifties, Arthur Bestor had severely criticized the social studies for a lowering of intellectual standards (Alilunas 1958; Bestor 1955); others had compared American education in general, including the social studies, to that of the USSR, and found the American system wanting (Haas 1977). The 1957 Sputnik crisis added immeasurable impetus to the critique of American education. By 1960, Siemers could report that teachers in California, and probably throughout the country, were calling for the development of a national secondary social studies curriculum from which local districts could draw. Sixty-two percent of his sample of 100 California world history teachers favored national leadership in this area, while only 13 percent definitely did not favor such leadership, and 25 percent had no opinion at all. As noted above, NCSS argued strongly for federal investment in the improvement of social science education as well as math, science, and foreign language instruction in the schools. (At least one voice was heard in Social Education arguing against a "national curriculum," although even he strongly urged experimentation. Robinson, in 1963, suggested that the last thing we needed at that point was national concensus--that was what we already had in the social studies curriculum, which had for the last 50 years displayed only minor variations in scope and sequence from one locality to the next. Revision through promotion of differentiation was Robinson's plea.)

The initial impulse in casting about for approaches to curriculum revision during the sixties seems to have been to look to the social sciences. The "newer" social sciences--those besides the ones traditionally a part of the social studies curriculum, history, geography, and government--became much more visible in the pages of Social Education in the mid-sixties. (Simultaneously, the tradition of social studies as reflective inquiry provided another approach to revision. Because both this and the social science approach emphasized methods of inquiry and both found their voices in funded projects, they are often thought of together. Probably the height of the emphasis on social science came in 1965, a year in which there appeared in Social Education a huge number of articles on the "new social studies" projects. Concomittant with the "rise of the social sciences" was a growing alarm voiced by historians, who were asking more and more frequently, "Is history on its way out of the schools?" (This alarm has not even yet abated, witness Kirkendall's 1975 report on the status of history in the schools.)

Toward the end of the sixties, the interest in social sciences began to be outshone by a host of "topical" interests claiming time in the curriculum: ethnic studies, women studies, area studies, environmental education, career education, consumer education, legal education, global education, values education, and so on. These seemed to represent another way of slicing into the problem of social studies curriculum revision. The appearance in the curriculum of the "fads," as some have called them, or of "social problems," as others have labelled them, seems to have been stimulated to a major extent by the unrest of the last sixties, which broke the supposed complacence of American society and brought these problems to the surface of our consciousness.

Finally, an account of the changing concerns of the social studies education profession would not be complete without mention of a very recent development: the so-called back-to-basics movement. Within the last two years, this movement has been much on the minds of social studies educators, who alternately perceive it as a threat to the very existence of social studies as part of the curriculum and as a call for the profession to stop jumping from one fad to the next and think through its basic purposes.

In fact, the call to reconsider basic purposes, scope, and sequence in the social studies seems to have become rather accute of late. Gross (1977) mentions the frustration expressed by teachers and others in the schools over the apparent "fragmentation" of the social studies curriculum. Shaver (1977) in his presidential address at the 1976 Annual Meeting of NCSS, criticized the profession for its "mindlessness"--its failure to think through its justification for existence. It would appear that the one great need in social studies at present is some sort of resolution to the question of definition. (The resolution could, of course, consist of some sort of agreement to accept the inevitability of a pluralistic definition.) The last 15-plus years of revisionist effort have not yet provided an answer to this question.

Summary of Needs as Perceived by the Social Studies Education Profession. One can see in the pages of *Social Education*, supplemented by key external sources, a progression of concerns in the profession over the last 20 years. In the late fifties, the interests of the profession were fairly well confined within the realm of history teaching: social studies educators wanted to understand the content of history and to learn ways to teach that content interestingly and effectively. Interest in disciplines other than history, particularly government and geography, surfaced from time to time, too. There was also a concern, largely resulting from pressures from the public, about how to teach about the USSR and communism.

In the sixties, the concerns of the profession shifted, with numerous calls for revision of the curriculum. Interest in the content and inquiry methodologies of the social sciences became quite visible; at the same time, an often overlapping interest in how to teach students to become reflective inquirers became more visible. The teaching of history remained a concern, but it had to share time with the other social sciences. The topic of communism, with its concomitant emphasis on patriotism and inculcation of American values, virtually disappeared by the mid-sixties. The emphasis on social science carried with it a commitment to "objectivity" in dealing with value issues.

In the late sixties, there appeared another shift, to a variegated pattern of topical concerns such as ethnic studies, environmental education, and career education. Included in this was a call for a new kind of values education, which would be neither the indoctrination approach advanced in the fifties nor the objective approach of the social sciences. Labels such as values clarification and moral reasoning were given to the new approaches to dealing with values.

And in the last few years, a sort of frustration with all the experimentation and proliferation of ideas on revision seems to have set in, resulting in calls for rethinking the "basics" of the social studies.

Viewpoints from Outside the Profession

There seem to have been two major categories of participants in the debate over social stuides during the last 20 years other than professional social studies educators. One category of participants would be the social scientist and the other, the lay public. To be sure, many of the parties in these debates can legitimately lay claim to being both a professional social studies educator and a social scientist or a layperson. Often participants in the debate have one foot in one "camp" and the other foot in another. (For instance, a number of social scientists are members of NCSS as well as a discipline-based learned society.) Thus, the distinctions among these categories are not clearcut. And yet, the activities people in these other categories can and have been regarded both by social studies educators and by these people themselves as forays from the outside--helpful or otherwise--into the domain of the social studies professional. We shall discuss perceptions of these two categories of "outsiders" as to needs in social studies education briefly below.

Social Scientists' Perceptions of Needs. The social scientists' influence in precollege social studies education rose to a position of relative dominance during the sixties and has waned somewhat since, although both individual social scientists and some of the social science learned societies are still quite active.

The social scientists preceived the prime need of the social studies at the beginning of the 1960s to be improvement in the teaching of the content and methodologies of the social sciences. Among the major expressions of this perception are three works cited previously: the 1962 ACLS/NCSS volume including the Berelson article; Morrissett 1967; and Morrissett and Stevens 1971. These volumes are at once representative of the thinking of social studies professionals and social scientists, underlining the point made above, that it is often difficult to distinguish the categories and also underling the extent to which the social scientists had come to influence the profession in the sixties.

Some social science disciplines, or at least their organizational embodiments, appear to have been more active than others in attempting to influence the social studies. Perhaps the most persistently active has been economics. The American Economic Association sponsored an extensive study of needs in economic education, which was published in 1961 (Economic Education in the Schools...1961). The report presented a rationale for including economics in the school curriculum and detailed the essential facts, concepts, and analytical tools to be included in economic education. The report included specific recommendations for the teaching of courses solely focused on economics as well as the teaching of economics in other courses, such as problems of democracy and history. It also made recommendations in regard to teaching materials, teacher education, the handling of controversial issues, and the like. (A list of recommendations from this report is presented in the Appendix.) The recommendations on essential content have served as criteria for judging the progress of economic education in a number of subsequent studies. (These subsequent studies are mentioned in Section 1.4 of this report.)

In addition to the AEA's Task Force report and subsequent studies under other auspices to determine progress in economic education, economists have been heavily involved in curriculum development efforts. The Joint Council on Economic Education has been the major vehicle for these efforts, employing a pluralistic, local district-based model of development. There have also been a few federally funded curriculum development efforts, although these were not sponsored by professional associations in economics. The economists' efforts have not abated in recent years, as have the efforts of some other disciplines. In 1976, a National Conference on Needed Research and Development in Precollege Economic Education was held under the joint sponsorship of JCEE, SSEC, and NCSS. The report from this conference (Wentworth et al. 1977) contains a comprehensive discussion of needs in economic education as perceived not only by economists but also by social studies educators who participated in the conference. (A copy of the list of needs developed at the conference is provided in the appendix.)

The American Political Science Association was a relative latecomer to attempts to influence the direction of precollegiate social studies, but has been quite active since its entry in the debate. The report of its Committee on Precollegiate Education (1971) is one of the most highly critical discussions of the state of social studies education to be found. It outlined the purposes of precollegiate education in political science, appraised the current condition of precollegiate education in the field, and made recommendations for improving that education. (A list of the committee's findings and recommendations is included in the Appendix.) Since the Precollegiate Committee's report, the APSA has embarked on a number of curriculum development efforts and other activities aimed at improving both precollegiate and collegiate instruction in the field.

The American Psychological Association has also published a needs statement in regard to psychology education at the precollege level (Hunt et al. 1972); however, we have not been able to lay our hands on a copy of this document as yet. Other sources have indicated that one hotly debated issue in regard to needs at the precollege level concerns the matter of whether psychology education at that level should focus on personal development or have a discipline ("scientific") orientation (see Journal of School Psychology, Spring 1967, and Kasschau and Wertheimer 1974). The APA seems to have preferred not to back a single, unified curriculum development effort (Bergstrom and Olson 1975), but the organization did sponsor the Human Behavior Project, which seems to have aborted in midstream in 1975-76.

The Association of American Geographers was, of course, active very early in the sixties with the High School Geography Project. And there has been a long tradition, among geographers, of interest in geography at the precollege level--note how long the Journal of Geography, a channel for these concerns, has been around. We have not, however, been able to locate any single "official" position statement or series of position statements coming from geographers such as those published by the AHA and APSA. The same situation seems to pertain for anthropologists and sociologists: they were both active early in the 1960s curriculum development project efforts (ACSP and SRSS) but "official" needs statements were not issued by the American Anthropological Assocaiton or the American Sociological Association.

Laypersons' Perceptions of Needs. It appears that "the public's" influence on the social studies curriculum has been particularly strong at four points in the last 20 years. First, in the fifties, tremendous pressure was apparently exerted on social studies educators to teach about the dangers of communism and the virtues of our democratic system. A well-known example of the kinds of arguments presented by the anti-communist participants in the debate would be Merrill Root's Brainwashing in the High Schools (1959), in which Root argued that the Korean prisoners of war who succumbed to communist brainwashing had not been educated in a proper appreciation of the American way of life and the evils of communism. Social studies educators felt themselves to be very much "under the gun" in the matter of teaching about communism, as well as other controversial issues, during the fifites. They were still paying attention to the communism issue as late as 1964 and the problem of dealing with controversial issues in the classroom has continued as a major concern throughout the 20-year period under examination, as indicated previously.

The second intervention of public influence seems to have developed simultaneously with the first, but took effect only after the anti-communism movement was on the wane. The thrust of public concern in this case focused on the intellectual quality of the schools. Bestor (1955) had argued that the school curriculum, and particularly the social studies (which he called "social stew"), had declined into a shoddy state. In his own words, he argued against "the insidious argument that schools and colleges to be democratic must lower their intellectual standards and water down their curricula" (p. 3). Conant (1959), while presenting a much more charitable view of the state of American educaton, nevertheless displayed a strong streak in favor of putting more intellectual starch in the curriculum, including some segments of the social studies curriculum. Other critics compared American schools to those in the USSR and found the American schools wanting in intellectual quality. (See Haas 1977, pp. 2-7, for an account of the criticisms of this period.) This second group of critics, thus, appears to have been related to the anti-communist critics in that many of their ideas stemmed from a fear of "losing out" to the USSR. However, the second group also spoke to a need for greater intellectual integrity in the schools, a concern not much in evidence in the anti-communist arguments.

The Sputnik crisis of 1957 appeared to give the intellectual-upgrading arguments new force. There was a genuine grassroots outcry for change in the schools, at least in the teaching of science, math, and foreign languages. Although the social studies professionals and the social scientists have traced the impetus for the "new social studies" back to this outcry, it is not entirely clear that "the public" was at that time calling for revision in the social studies. To be sure, a certain segment of the public--what might be called the highly educated public, such as Keller (1961)--were demanding improvement in social studies. However, calls for reform specifically in the social studies from the "average" public were not nearly so clear here as they were in the case of, say, the anti-communist movement.

A third upsurge of demand from the public came in the middle and late sixties, with the various pulses of societal unrest--the civil rights movement, the free speech movement, the anit-war movement, the environmental movement, and so on. These have been called by Haas (1977) the "rude intrusions," uncomfortable reminders to social studies educators that perhaps teaching the social sciences would not adequately handle all curriculum problems. The topical curriculum that evolved in the late sixties and early seventies shows the influence of these public concerns on the social studies profession.

Finally, in the last few years, a fourth intervention by the public in the curriculum has developed. It would appear that this new pressure on social studies educators comes from a different public than that of the late sixties. The new intervenor is the so-called back-to-basics movement and its adherents are not the protestors of the sixties. In a way, they seem to be protesting the protestors of the sixties and the changes in the curriculum wrought by those earlier activists as well as the social scientists a few years prior to the social unrest. In some ways, this new source of pressure on the social studies curriculum harks back to the pressures exerted in the fifties. Although there are no strident calls for anti-communist education, there are demands that the schools teach "our values" and "our way of life." Further, many of the new critics pick up the Bestor thread, demanding intellectual discipline through the teaching of traditional history and the like. (See, for instance, the literature of the Council for Basic Education.) It remains to be seen what the response of the social studies profession will be to this newest version of needs as perceived by the public.

Summary Observations

1) One of the major problems--and perhaps the major problem--in the social studies over the past 20 years has been that of defining the field: What are the purposes of goals of the social studies? What is the rationale for including social studies in the curriculum? What is the scope of the social studies (What kinds of content does the social studies include)? In what sequence should this content be taught? and, What kinds of instructional methods are appropriate for teaching the social studies?

2) Because the definitional qestion is so far from settled, it is difficult to pinpoint needs in any precise sense. Nevertheless, statements of goals, standards, and needs have been developed from time to time by various groups within and outside of the social studies profession. In addition, it is possible to discern, from a general reading of the literature, what have been the important concerns or questions in need of answers at various times over the 20-year period, 1955-1975.

3) One of the most obvious and enduring concerns of social studies educators has been academic freedom. The social studies, dealing as they do with human affairs, lend themselves to controversy. The National Council for the Social Studies has been able to find a high degree of consensus among social studies educators on the need for protection of teachers in dealing with controversial issues in the classroom.

4) The curricular concerns of the profession (and, apparently, the general public) in the late fifties centered on the teaching of history and American values.

5) Around 1960, there was a rather overwhelming demand both from within the social studies profession and from the public for improving the intellectual quality of what was taught in the schools, including the social studies. The social science community strongly advocated that this upgrading include a broadening of the social studies curriculum to reflect the frontier thinking of the social sciences. This social science emphasis was largely supported by social studies educators and by at least certain influential segments of the public at large.

6) The societal unrest of the mid-sixties and early seventies brought a new perception of needs to the surface--the need for teaching about societal problems, such as minority rights, environmental pollution, and global interdependence.

7) The succeeding waves of curricular revision in the social studies--first with the incorporation of social science content and the "inquiry" method and then with the injection of numerous topical concerns such as ethnic studies, consumer education, and career education--have not yet produced a social studies scope and sequence satisfying to a broad constituency of social studies educators, social scientists, and laypersons. The most current issues of concern to all these groups include: (a) the "fragmentation" of social studies curriculum into chaotic series of topics with no apparent overall sequence of core subjects providing a common base of knowledge for all students, and (b) the problem of how to deal with values in the social studies curriculum.

Section 4.0

THE "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES"

This section does not attempt to present a complete picture of the rise and decline of the "new social studies" movement, since that has been done elsewhere. Rather, we offer a very brief historical sketch and then proceed to describe a few aspects of the "new social studies" that may be of particular interest to the National Science Foundation. First, we discuss the characteristics of the "new social studies" and then the major criticisms of the movement. Finally, we present a number of studies that have attempted to determine the extent of use of the products of the national curriculum projects of the sixties and early seventies.

Like the previous section, this section of the report has been treated as a single unit, rather than dividing it into a series of numbered subsections, each with its own summary observations. Thus, the summary observations dealing with the "new social studies" are grouped together at the end of this section.

Sources

Articles and papers treating the "new social studies" as a whole (rather than one or a few specific projects), either from a critical or a descriptive viewpoint, were examined as background for this section. Only sources that explicitly mentioned the "new social studies" by name were used, except for two pre-1965 items (1965 was the year in which the name, "new social studies," was first applied to the movement). Also with two exceptions, only sources appearing in 1965 or after were used. Most of the sources appeared in Social Education or Social Studies, as it turned out. A total of 57 sources were used. (In addition, Hazel Hertzberg reacted to the first draft of this section by handwritten letter in May 1977. A number of her ideas and observations have been incorporated.)

Discussion and Documentation

Historical Sketch. No attempt is made here to present a comprehensive history of the "new social studies." That has been done admirably by John Haas (1977), whose monograph furnished much of the information for the historical sketch that follows.

The "new social studies" movement was part of a wider response to the "great debate" over the quality of education in the U.S. that took place in the mid-1950s. That debate arose outside the educational establishment, and it centered on accusations that the schools of the United States neglected certain subjects, such as reading, mathematics, physical sciences, and foreign languages; that U.S. schools were sadly lacking in comparison to Soviet and Western European schools; and that there was too much emphasis on "soft" Progressive approaches to education in our schools.

The 1957 launching of Sputnik moved the response to these criticisms onto a new plane. Greatly increased funding from the federal government stimulated greatly increased activity in science and mathematics education.

But it was not until several years later that calls for dramatic change appeared in the social studies. Again, these calls came initially from outside the profession. They noted that the social studies had been largely untouched by the innovative fervor occurring in other fields, although the social studies were probably in greater need of improvement than even those fields. They claimed that the social studies curriculum had not changed since 1916, although both the society and the social disciplines had changed drastically. It was suggested that we ought to drop the fuzzy label "social studies" and the notion of "citizenship education," replacing them with the more up-to-date and intellectually disciplined approach, to be referred to as "history and the social sciences."

Common practice in the profession attributes the beginnings of the "new social studies" to the launching of the national social studies curriculum development projects in the early sixties. Hazel Hertzberg (personal letter to Karen Wiley, May 1977) has suggested that this was only the beginning of one phase--the culminating phase--of the movement. Although it is almost impossible to document through published information, there was apparently substantial state and local response (in the form of guideline development and classroom experiementation) to criticisms of the social studies a number of years before the movement crystallized in the form of national development projects.* Also, the debate of the fifties and early sixties had given birth to a rather clear ideology for the movement some time before 1965, when the movement was christened "new social studies." Thus, considerable groundwork had been laid before the national projects were launched. The projects were able to draw on the well-developed ideology and the results of "grassroots" classroom experimentation.

(The discussion that follows in this section doew not reflect the pre-project, evolutionary phase of the movement, since it relies almost wholly on sources dated 1965 and after. This limitation was made for two reasons. First, it was believed that the project phase would be of particular interest to NSF, since it had a major role in that phase- Second, the difficulty of identifying documentary sources, particularly related to classroom practice, in the prior period suggested limiting our focus to the period in which the characteristics and criticisms of the movement had become clearly marked. Readers will be able to detect strands of the evolutionary phase of the movement in other sections of this report once they have read through the following sections identifying characteristics and criticisms of the movement.)

---

*Bernice Wade's dissertation (1965) and an NCSS survey of school systems in 1965 (Allen 1967) do provide documentation for the argument that extensive curriculum revision activity was taking place at the state and local levels at least simultaneously with the establishment of the national projects. Wade surveyed state and local curriculum guides for the decade preceding 1965 and found them to reflect major changes in content and lesser changes in objectives and methodologies in the social studies. Allen reported that the NCSS survey of 500 school systems found virtually all had some type of curriculum revision under way. Allen also noted the "mushrooming: of the number of state social studies supervisor positions.

By 1967, approximately 75 projects, funded by USOE, NSF, and various private groups, coupld be listed in a directory published in Social Education (A Directory of Social Studies Projects, 1967). This was the height of the "new social studies" movement. Among the more notable of the projects were the four funded by NSF: Sociological Resources for the Social Studies, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, High School Geography Project, and Man: A Course of Study.

A few years leter, a "second wave" of projects was under way, including the Comparing Political Experiences Project, the Human Behavior Project, and the Human Sciences Program (BSCS), among others funded by the Foundation. This second wave responded to many of the criticisms that had been leveled at the first wave. (For instance, the first wave of projects had been criticized for a lack of attention to the social issues that had reached acute proportions in the U.S.--the Vietnam War, problems of ethnic diversity, changing life styles, and the like. The second wave gave increased attention to the value problems involved in such issues.)

A total of 111 social studies projects were listed in ASCD's directory by 1971 (Taylor and Groom 1971). By 1972, 26 of the "first wave" projects had published curriculum materials (New In-Depth Evaluations . . . 1972). But, after about 1973, the "new social studies" movement appears to have faded as a distinctly discernible trend.

The sections that follow summarize the characteristics of the "new social studies" as perceived by a number of analysts over the life of the final "project" phas of the movement; take note of some of the disagreements about those characteristics; summarize the criticisms that have been directed at the "new social studies"; and summarize what little data exist pertaining to the impact of the "new social studies."

Characteristics of the "New Social Studies"

A number of writers have attempted to describe the salient characteristics of the "new social studies." Such descriptive efforts appeared as soon as the movement was christened* and reappeared throughout the life of the movement. The list below is a collation of several lists of characteristics of the "new social studies" that have appeared during the last 12 years.

1) Content and Organization

a) Emphasis on the structure of the social science disciplines as basic content and organizing frameworks for the social studies. Structure refers to the concepts and generalizations central to the disciplines and the relationships among the concepts and generalizations. Emphasis is on teaching concepts and relationships instead of isolated facts. (Fenton and Good 1965; Fraser 1965, 1968; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Jarolimek 1971, Chapin and Gross 1972; Pearson 1973; Haas 1977)

b) Emphasis on processes as content: teaching the methodologies of the social science disciplines, teaching students inquiry skills. (Fenton and Good 1965; Fraser 1968; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Jarolimek 1971; Chapin and Gross 1972; Pearson 1973; Haas 1977)

c) Greater emphasis on content from the behavioral sciences, especially anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, and social psychology, and decreased emphasis on history and geography. (Fenton and Good 1965; Fraser 1965, 1968; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Chapin and Gross 1972; Pearson 1973)

d) Attempts to bring the latest findings and methodologies from the frontiers of research in the disciplines into the classroom, to shorten the time lag between research and implementation. (Fenton and Good 1965)

---

*The naming of the movement, "new social studies," is generally attributed to Fenton and Good, in their 1965 Social Education article.

e) Experimentation with integration of content from several disciplines: interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary approaches. (Fraser 1968: Sanders and Tanck 1970; Jarolimek 1971; Chapin and Gross 1972)

f) Emphasis on the separate social science disciplines and history (Haas 1977)

g) Incorporating world, non-Western, and cross-cultural perspectives into the curriculum. (Fraser 1965, 1968; Sanders and Tanck 1970)

h) Greater attention to values and valuing. (Sanders and Tanck 1970; Jarolimek 1971; Pearson 1973)

i) Emphasis on cognitive content and processes, with little attention to values and valuing. (Haas 1977)

j) Greater attention than in the past to controversial social issues. (Sanders and Tanck 1970; Jarolimek 1971)

k) More in-depth study of specific issues, themes, and topics, and less concern for "covering" (surveying) a whole field, such as American history. (Fraser 1965; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Chapin and Gross 1972; Pearson 1973)

l) Greater attention to problems of sequence, both within courses and throughout the entire K-12 curriculum. Emphasis on step-by-step building of skills, concepts, and the like. Considerable experimentation with grade placement of subject matter (Fenton and Good 1965; Fraser 1965, 1968; Sanders and Tanck 1970)

m) Acceptance of the curriculum sequence as it is and working within broad, existing course titles to insert new content into the curriculum; particularly, beginning reform at the high school level, where subjects are manifested as discrete courses. (Haas 1977)

2) Instructional Approaches and Materials

a) Heavy reliance on inquiry/inductive/discovery strategies of instruction (although there was great variety in how inquiry/induction/discovery were defined). Active student involvement in learning was sought. It was thought that such instructional strategies would produce higher student motivation and greater transfer of learning. (Fenton and Good 1965; Fraser 1965, 1968; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Jarolimek 1971; Chapin and Gross 1972; Pearson 1973; Haas 1977)

b) Concern for individual differences. (Jarolimek 1971)

c) Emphasis on academically talended students. (Haas 1977)

d) Emphasis on the new, Brunerian, view of readiness, that any child can be taught anything at any age in some intellectually honest way. (Fraser 1965; Haas 1977)

e) Emphasis on giving greater assistance to the teacher through workshops, training films, training books, and extensive teacher's guides describing rationale, objectives, lesson plans, evaluation techniques, and the like. (Fenton and Good 1965; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Haas 1977)

f) Emphasis on materials as the most important factor in improving instruction. (Haas 1977)

g) Utilization of a wide variety of media in addition to or in place of a textbook, including films and filmstrips, games and simulations, primary source documents, photographs, and realia. (Fenton and Good 1965; Fraser 1965, 1968; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Jarolimek 1971; Chapin and Gross 1972)

h) Provision of all materials essential to instruction. (Sanders and Tanck 1970)

3) Development Process

a) Curriculum development was viewed as an experimental, research-and-development process involving one or more cycles of development, fieldtesting, and revision. (Sanders and Tanck 1970; Haas 1977)

b) Products were usually turned over the commercial publishers for final publication and distribution. Arrangements for final publication involved taking into account the interests of the public, the universities and development centers, the authors, and the publishers. (Fenton and Good 1965; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Haas 1977)

c) Curriculum development took a lot of time and money. (Haas 1977)

d) Development projects brought together a variety of people on their staffs, including scholars in the disciplines, learning theorists, practicing precollege teachers, psychometricians, curriculum specialists, and artists and audiovisual experts. (Fenton and Good 1965; Fraser 1965; Sanders and Tanck 1970)

e) Although people in other roles were acceptable as staff members, projects tended to draw their leadership from the academic disciplines. (The learned societies often played key roles in organizing the projects.) It was thought that these people had the key knowledge necessary for development (knowledge of the disciplines) and that their prestige was an important factor in legitimation and dissemination. Emphasis was on an alliance between teachers and scholars (with scholars as the clearly senior allies), explicitly reducing role of school administrators and college methods professors. (Haas 1977)

f) In short, curriculum development was seen as a project type of effort, not a task for an individual or a local committee with limited funds and limited time.

Disagreement about the Characteristics of the "New Social Studies"

A quick scanning of the list of characteristics turns up several incompatible items, such as the claim that the "new social studies" paid special attention to values versus the claim that it did not. A reading of the list of criticisms of the "new social studies," in the following section, also uncovers incongruities in perceptions of what exactly constituted the "new social studies." For instance, some critics, as well as some of the analysts cited above, have claimed that the "new social studies" was not concerned with integrating the disciplines, while other analysts have argued that one of the main characteristics of the "new social studies" was the attempt to produce multi- and interdisciplinary curricula.

Briefly summarized, the areas of disagreement about what constitutes the "new social studies" are these:

1) whether the "new social studies" is overwhelmingly single discipline oriented or primarily multi- or interdisciplinary.

2) whether the "new social studies" fails to attend to values and valuing processes or has brought these concerns into the forefront of the curriculum.

3) whether the "new social studies" does or does not reflect concern for controversial social issues.

4) whether the "new social studies" movement did or did not attend to questions of curriculum sequence.

5) whether the "new social studies" attended to invididual student differences or concentrated primarily (or solely) on above-average students.

6) whether the "new social studies" was or was not characterized by a heightened concern for evaluation, including both the development of techniques to measure student achievement on new objectives and the formative and summative evaluation of the "new social studies" products themselves.

7) whether the "new social studies" projects did or did not involve a variety of educational personnel other than academicians in major roles during development.

These disagreements can be attributed to at least three sources. The first is the normal tendency for different people to look at the same thing but highlight different aspects when describing it and employ different metrics to determine the presence or absence of a trait.

A second source of disagreement is the tendency of different people to look at different things, describe them differently, but then call them by the same name. (A related situation is one in which overlapping subsets of a larger thing are perceived as constituting the whole.) Northup (1974) directed attention to this phenomenon when he pointed out that the "new social studies" is really plural; there are at least two main thrusts within the "new social studies," each with a different conception of the role of the disciplines and their methodologies (the "public issues" thrust, embodied in the Harvard/Oliver and Shaver materials, and the "social science" thrust, embodied in the NSF-sponsored materials as well as others).

A third source of disagreement has come into play recently. As the products of the "new social studies" projects began to be disseminated and critized widely, a "second wave" of development, taking into consideration the weaknesses of the first wave, occurred (Haas 1977). Also, many imitations of the original products, with slight adjustments here and there, began to appear. In other words, the "new social studies" movement, as it bagan to have an impact on practice, also began to lose its distinct identity. What may have been a rather clearly defined movement at first has grown by accretion and come to incorporate many additional characteristics. Some disagreements about the "new social studies" characteristics may be the result of broadening of the label to include anything new in the social studies. For instance, the disagreement about whether the "new social studies" does or does not emphasize values and valuing may be a result of the fact that many "second wave" projects attended to this early criticism of the "new social studies" and began to incorporate more explicit values material.

Criticisms of the "New Social Studies"

Below are listed the numerous criticisms of the "new social studies" that have cropped up since the early sixties, when the movement began to appear publicly. They have been grouped into ten categories.

1) Criticisms of the Inquiry/Discovery/Inductive Method as Used in the "New Social Studies"

a) There is no evidence for the superiority of inquiry methods over other instructional methods. (Robinson 1963; Allen 1967)

b) The inquiry method, as used in the "new social studies," is really seduction rather than induction. Closed-ended "discovery" activities tend to dominate. Students really are being asked to sleuth out what are the teacher's (or materials') preconceived notions, using prearranged data packages. Students are given a false sense of accomplishment. An inaccurate understanding of induction lies at the bottom of most materials; induction can only provide tentative answers, but most materials are still stuck in the "right answer" rut. Hence, students are led through a needlessly involved process for arriving at a "right" answer. (Reactions . . . 1965; Weisenberg 1968; La Forse 1970; Newton 1973; Tucker 1972; Pearson 1973)

c) There is too little attention to instructional strategies other than inquiry methods, particularly social science inquiry methods. There seems to be an unquestioned assumption that the social scientist's methods are appropriate for children. Such methods have serious limitations and there are many other ways in which children can and do learn. (Reactions . . . 1965; Eulie 1969)

d) There are certain problems with the use of original source materials, particularly of the historical variety, among them the introduction of irrelevancies and difficult language. Also, overdoing the use of raw data has its dangers, not the least of which is tediousness. Constant inquiry can be as boring as constant anything else. (Anthony 1967; Eulie 1969; Sanders and Tanck 1970)

e) Not everything should be open to inquiry and questioning, perhaps. For instance, questioning of certain core values of our society should not be encouraged until youngsters are mature enough to deal with such issues. (Benjamin 1975; Wiley 1976)

f) Some methods used commonly by social scientists can intrude upon human rights under certain circumstances. For instance, "participant observation" in the family or peer group might be considered an invasion of privacy ("spying") by those observed. (Wiley 1976)

g) It is not always possible to identify discrete elements and sequences of method in order to teach them; for instance, what is the historical "method"? If "learning by doing" is the aim, what is "doing" in history? (Krug 1966)

2) Criticisms Related to the Content of the "New Social Studies"

a) The "new social studies," following the lead of the new math and new science, have the possibly mistaken notion that there is something identifiable as "the structure of the discipline" for each of the social sciences and that this structure is what should be taught in the social studies. If there are such structures in the social sciences, they are many and there is no consensus about them; further they are fluctuating constantly, simply because of the nature of the subject matter--human affairs. (Krug 1966; Newmann 1967; Eulie 1969)

b) The "new social studies" developers have ignored sources of the curriculum other than the social science disciplines. (Reactions . . . 1965; Anthony 1967)

(1) The nature of society, its needs, problems, and characteristics, is one such source largely ignored. The content chosen for inclusion in

"new social studies" materials displays a low social consciousness. This lack of "relevance" shows up particularly starkly in contrast to the "rude intrusions" (war protests, counterculture, and the like) of the late sixties. Little attention is given to the great public problems. (Foshay 1970; Jarolimek 1973; Haas 1977)

(2) The nature of the child or youth has also been largely ignored as a source of the curriculum. Criticisms related to this point are discussed under 4-a below.

(3) Restricting the sources on which one draws in developing curricula inhibits creative work and puts limits on the kinds of things that can be dealt with in the curriculum. For instance, the disciplines offer little in the areas of decision-making skills, thought-process skills, feelings and attitudes, and value conflicts and commitments. Social science only deals with descriptions of reality, not questions of prescription; the latter are dealt with in the other sources of the curriculum. (Shaver 1967; Newmann 1967)

c) The "new social studies" takes an overly cognitive approach. (Tucker 1972)

(1) There are other ways of knowing besides the "objective" scientific method. Kids know that human affairs are not purely objective and they distrust approaches that rely solely on so-called objective methods. (Traverso 1969)

(2) The "new social studies" does not give sufficient attention to normative and affective matters, which are central to any understanding of human affairs. (Reactions . . . 1965; Allen 1967; Sanders and Tanck 1970; Tucker 1972; Kohlberg 1973)

d) Method has been made an end in itself, replacing content or being used as a means of avoiding the hard judgments about what content should be included in the curriculum. (Anthony 1967; LaForse 1970)

e) There is vastly undue emphasis on teaching generalizations in the "new social studies." Most generalizations from the social sciences are trite and obvious; human uniqueness and creativity--not sameness, generality--are what is important. Vague generalities are being substituted for hard factual material, thus destroying evidential standards and, in all likelihood, destroying understanding of the generalizations. The historical approach, with its emphasis on the singular and on the detail that gives meaning to generalizations, should be given more attention. (Krug 1966; Weisenberg 1968)

f) The "new social studies" are too narrowly specialized, too much oriented to single disciplines. (Tucker 1972; Berkwits 1973; Haas 1977)

g) Several content areas in which the "new social studies" are weak have been mentioned above (for instance, "thought-process concepts"). Other weak areas that have been cited in the literature include:

(1) community-based learning (Tucker 1972; Barr 1973)

(2) social activism (Barr 1973)

(3) personal growth (Barr 1973)

(4) intercultural learning (Barr 1973)

(5) chronology and its significance for understanding cause and effect (Krug 1966; Weisenberg 1968; Pearson 1973)

(6) conflict is emphasized, while cooperation is played down (Benjamin 1975)

(7) individual rights are emphasized at expense of understanding societal interests (Benjamin 1975)

(8) undue emphasis is given the current and immediate (Benjamin 1975)

(9) Historical figures are excessively "humanized" (the "feet of clay" syndrome) (Benjamin 1975)

(10) too much emphasis is put on the inadequacies of American society (Benjamin 1975)

(11) too much emphasis on expression of opinion and too little on judging the validity of opinions on basis of procedures through which they were developed (Benjamin 1975)

h) The "new social studies" teach value relativism and appear to advocate values that are diametrically opposed to those on which our society is based. (Wiley 1976)

3) Criticisms Related to the Objectives and Rationale of the "New Social Studies" and Its Place in the Social Studies Scope and Sequence

a) Little or no attention has been given to elaborating objectives and rationales. In those cases in which developers have shown some concern, their discussions of these matters are only superficial. It appears that the objectives and rationales produced by most developers of the "new social studies" are primarily just rationalizations for what they've already produced. It also appears that the primary objective of the "new social studies" is to preserve or expand the influence of the social science disciplines in the curriculum. (Anthony 1967)

b) Serious questions can be raised about the relevance of social science content and methods for most people, particularly those who are not college bound. Why should children be taught academic skills? Our main concern should be citizen education, not the care and feeding of "junior social scientists." The substitution of the scholar's method for his product is unwarranted and unnecessary unless one assumes that the scholar's method is also appropriate for personal and public decision making. There is a difference between methods appropriate for validation of knowledge claims and methods appropriate for making public policy decisions. (Newmann 1965; Krug 1966; Edgerton 1967; Shaver 1967; Pearson 1973)

c) The "new social studies" movement has given little attention to problems of scope and sequence in the social studies curriculum. In fact, it appears that the movement has diverted attention entirely from this. Discussion of scope and sequence was abandoned at the same time the "new social studies" was on the rise. Almost every project focused narrowly on one discipline or one course and grade level in the curriculum. The diversity of ideas and materials produced by the projects have made the social studies a confusing conglomerate of unrelated parts. Little or no thought has been given to what the new materials were replacing and whether some of the courses edged out ought to be retained; for instance, American history is being given less attention than it ought to be given. (Becker 1965; Reactions . . . 1965; Krug 1966; Allen 1967; Selakovich 1975; Wiley 1976; Haas 1977)

4) Criticisms Related to Needs and Characteristics of Users

a) The "new social studies" did not pay sufficient attention to the needs and characteristics of students.

(1) The "new social studies" was directed mainly toward above-average students. (Reactions . . . 1965; Sanders and Tanck 1970)

(2) Intellectual operations of academic professions may be boring and irrelevant to the lay population. (Newmann 1965; Krug 1966)

(3) The "new social studies" neglects individual differences among students. (Sanders and Tanck 1970; Haas 1977)

(4) The "new social studies" neglects cognitive and moral stages of development. (Kohlberg 1973)

(5) The "new social studies" neglects the needs and interests of the child as one possible source of the curriculum. (Anthony 1967)

(6) Younger students can't handle moral relativism. (Wiley 1976)

(7) Students are turning down the "invitation to inquire." (Sanders and Tanck 1970)

(8) What appeals to an adult may be too obvious or too obscure to a child. (Sanders and Tanck 1970)

(9) Youngsters distrust a purely "objective" approach to human affairs. (Traverso 1969)

b) The "new social studies" did not pay sufficient attention to the needs and characteristics of teachers.

(1) The "new social studies" tends to reduce the teacher's central role in the classroom, his/her professionalism, autonomy, and creativity; it tries to be "teacher proof." (Reactions . . . 1965; Jewett and Ribble 1967)

(2) The "new social studies" substitutes one slavish method (ticking off the teaching unit) for another (going through the text page by page). (Mannello 1970; Tucker 1972)

(3) The "new social studies" does not consider the new, heavier responsibilities being placed upon teachers. (Allen 1967)

(4) The "new social studies" neglects differences among teachers' styles, capabilities, and the like. (Sanders and Tanck 1970; Haas 1977)

(5) The "new social studies" runs contrary to certain norms widely held among classroom teachers:

--primacy of facts in social studies instruction

--learning cycle should begin with storage of information

--the teacher is the processor of knowledge and should give students the benefit of this rather than letting them share their ignorance

--learning is a serious, not a fun, business

--personal values and controversial issues shouldn't be explored in the classroom (Kardatzke 1975)

(6) Using the new materials requires much teacher effort in curriculum rethinking and rebuilding, preparation for classes, and training. (Sanders and Tanck 1970)

(7) The "new social studies" materials are too radically different from old approaches to be easily accepted by teachers. (Selakovich 1975)

c) The "new social studies" did not pay sufficient attention to the roles teacher educators (methods teachers) in colleges might play in their development and dissemination.

(1) Teacher educators were bypassed by the developers; inservice training was emphasized to the neglect of preservice training. This resulted in the alienation (sometimes expressed in antagonism; sometimes displayed in ignorance) of teacher educators from the projects. (Tucker 1972)

(2) Teacher education programs in colleges were slow to incorporate the "new social studies." (Selakovich 1975)

d) Too little attention was paid to the elementary level by the "new social studies." (Allen 1967)

e) The "new social studies" did not consider how the new materials would fit with certain administrative conditions.

(1) Teaching the new materials at the elementary level might require greater specialization than currently practiced by teachers; could lead to departmentalization. (Sanders and Tanck 1970)

(2) Many of the new materials were incompatible with other popular innovations, such as flexible scheduling, open space, and individualized instruction. (Risinger 1973)

f) The "new social studies" paid virtually no attention to what parents and other laypersons thought the schools should be teaching. (Wiley 1976)

5) Criticisms of the Developers of the "New Social Studies"

a) The development teams were overloaded with social scientists and "underloaded" with classroom teachers, educational psychologists, curriculum specialists, methods professors, and others who could have contributed important expertise. (Anthony 1967; Tucker 1972)

b) Development of curriculum materials should have been left to commercial publishers in the private sector; federal government interference in this traditionally private enterprise was unwarranted and, in fact, dangerous. (Wiley 1976)

c) The attitudes and manners of the "new social studies" developers and advocates have been found wanting in the following respects:

(1) They were possessed of a "neurotic" sense of urgency, detrimental to considered reflection upon their task. (Robinson 1963)

(2) They suffered from too much missionary zeal, believing that they had "the answer" to end all conflicts in the social studies. (Jewett and Ribble 1967)

(3) They suffered from a myopia and ignorance about historical precedents. This led them to repeat many mistakes of the past. Their mistaken claim that what they were doing was "new" came either from this or from a strong streak of charlatanism. (Eulie 1969; Hertzberg 1971; Ellis 1971)

(4) They suffered from a high degree of arrogance. The "experts" and the "bureaucrats" were allied together against the "people" in an attempt to dictate what ought to be taught and how. (Wiley 1976)

6) Criticisms Related to Evaluation in the "New Social Studies"

a) The "new social studies" didn't pay much attention to developing student evaluation procedures to go with the new content they were introducing. (Reactions . . . 1965; Sanders and Tanck 1970)

b) Little or no formative and summative evaluation was done by the developers of the new materials. (Allen 1967; Selakovich 1975)

7) Criticisms Related to Cost

a) The materials themselves were too expensive. (Sanders and Tanck 1970; Selakovich 1975)

b) Implementation of the new materials entailed greater costs in time and money than the materials they replaced. More teacher time was required to select materials, build curricula, undergo training, and prepare to teach the materials on a day-to-day basis. (Sanders and Tanck 1970)

8) Criticisms Related to the "New Orthodoxy"

a) Premature dissemination of "new social studies" ideas, before adequate examination and revision had been accomplished, may have led to a new kind of inflexibility. There is danger of a new orthodoxy replacing the old. Substitution of one slavish method for another has been noted. (Eulie 1969; Mannello 1970; LaForse 1970; Tucker 1972)

b) The "new social studies" was an attempt to install a "national curriculum" in this country. (Wiley 1976)

9) Criticisms Related to the "New Hype"

The "new social studies" suffer from an overdose of gimmickry (games and such). (Benjamin 1975)

10) Criticisms Related to the Dissemination of the "New Social Studies"

a) Contrary to hopes and predictions, the "new social studies" have not disseminated widely. (Selakovich 1975; Hahn 1977b)

b) The projects may not have paid enough attention at an early enough time to the problems of dissemination; there was a belief that, if the products were good, they would disseminate themselves. (Hahn 1977b)

c) Use of government funds to disseminate the new materials in competition with commercial publishers was an unjustified interference in the private market mechanism. (Wiley 1976)

Impact of the "New Social Studies"

Very little appears to be known for certain about the impact the "new social studies" has had.

There are some hints and a little data about the indirect influences of the movement on classrooms--that is, the influence that the projects have had on intermediate groups, such as publishers and university methods professors and researchers, who may have subsequently influenced classroom teachers.

A visit to the publishers' exhibits at an annual convention of the National Council for the Social Studies leaves one with the impression that the "new social studies" movement has had a fairly substantial impact on commercial textbook publishers. In the early 1970s, many commercially developed materials resembling project materials in appearance and substance began to crop up more and more frequently in publishers' convention displays. However, this is only an impression; no controlled study has been done to determine whether recent publishers' products have indeed been influenced strongly by the project models. There is even less "hard data" on whether the new publisher-produced materials have sold well are are being used widely and successfully in the schools. "Common knowledge" in the field (Gross 1977), backed up by this writer's conversations with publishers' representatives and "new social studies" developers, indicates that most of the project materials and the innovative publisher materials have not sold well in comparison to the high expectations for them.

In all, however, there is virtually no information on the possible indirect influences of the projects through the intermediary of textbook publishers.

There is a small amount of evidence regarding the influence the projects may have had on methods professors. Tucker (1972) surveyed social studies methods professors and found a fairly high degree of alienation from the "new social studies" among them. They were critical of the projects and had generally not been included in the movement's activities. In all, they were not very likely to be passing on the "wisdom" of the projects to their students. This alienation was more marked among those with appointments solely to education faculties than among those with joint appointments in education and the social sciences or history. Thompson's 1973 follow-up to Tucker's study presented a slightly more optimistic picture of methods professors' attitudes toward and use of the project materials.

Also, perusal of the reviews of research during the sixties and early seventies leaves one with an impression that there never was a major thrust called "new social studies" during this period. Research involving the curriculum development projects is mentioned rather infrequently by the reviewers, although copious evaluative research was conducted in conjunction with the projects (Wiley and Superka 1977). Research in the context of development did not appear to be foremost on the minds of social studies researchers.

There is some evidence related to the direct impact of project-developed materials on classrooms, although this information is far from definitive. Table 46 summarizes findings from nine studies of the extent of awareness and use of "new social studies" materials. (The reader will note that some information is missing; this is due to the fact that we were not able to obtain copies or summaries of some of these studies.) Two additional tables (47 and 48), drawn from Turner and Haley (1977) and Switzer et al. (1977), show use breakdowns by materials package. Three conclusions can be drawn from these tables:

1) The extent of awareness of "new social studies" materials is fairly high. Most studies report the percentage of respondents who have heard of at least one of the sets of materials is somewhere over 50 percent.

Table 46.

EXTENT OF AWARENESS AND USE OF "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" PROJECT MATERIALS

Summary of Surveys

Study	States	Sample	Return Rate	% Respondents Aware of Materials	% Respondents Using Materials	Number of Materials Listed on Questionnaire	NSF Materials
Hahn (1977a) (study done in 1975-75)	IN	473	54%	60%		22 packages	ACSP Subject to Citizen HSGP SRSS
	OH		38%				
	GA	438	64%	51%			
	FL		66%				
		soc. st. tchrs. 9-12	tot. 495 resps.				
Switzer et al.	IL	est. 700 secondary soc. st. tchrs; 100 schools	37.6% est.	87%	50%+	10 packages	ACSP HSGP SRSS
	IN		tot. 252 resps.				
	MI						
	WI						
	OH						

Study	States	Sample	Return Rate	%Respondents Aware of Materials	% Respondents Using Materials	Number of Materials Listed on Questionnaire	NSF Materials
Turner & Haley (1977) (study done in 1974)	TX	4,783 or fewer (est. # soc. st. tchrs. in 600 schls.)	23.2% (est.)		26%	9 packages	ACSP HSGP SRSS
	CA		20.7% (est.)		43%		
	CN		17.6% (est.)		48%		
	CO		21.8% (est.)		44%		
			tot. 980 resps.				
Walker (1974)	NE	441 sec. soc. st. tchrs. (one from each high schl. in state)	80% (353)	73% 257	36% (126 schools)	20 packages	
Wells (1973)	OK	sec. soc. st. tchrs.		25%	11%-		
Weidner (1972)	AL	175 Am. hist. tchrs. (110 sec. schools)			10%	15	

Study	States	Sample	Return Rate	% Respondents Aware of Materials	% Respondents Using Materials	Nunber of Materials Listed on Questionnaire	NSF Materials
Robeson (1974)	Prince Georges County, MD	all sec. tchrs. (not just soc st.?)	51% tot. 273 resps.		37% (75% of resps. with inservice training were using; 31% without were using)		
Guenther & Dumas (1973)	KN MO						
Bragaw (1974)							

Table 47.

Use of Project Material by State and Total Respondents

	State											
	Michigan N=83		Ohio N=54		Wisconsin N=31		Illinois N=49		Indiana N=34		Total*	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	5	6.0	1	1.9	2	6.5	3	6.1	3	8.8	14	5.6
ACSP	10	12.0	0	0	1	3.2	2	4.1	1	2.9	15	5.6
Berkeley	1	1.2	0	0	1	3.2	1	2.0	0	0	3	1.2
Carnegie	17	20.5	7	13.0	6	19.4	9	18.4	8	23.5	47	18.7
Harvard	18	21.7	7	13.0	8	25.8	10	20.4	7	20.6	50	20.2
HSGP	4	4.8	1	1.9	2	6.5	5	10.2	1	2.9	13	5.2
Indiana	12	14.5	3	5.6	1	3.2	4	8.2	6	17.6	26	10.4
Law in Am. Society	17	20.5	5	9.3	6	19.4	10	20.4	6	17.6	44	17.6
San Jose	0	0	0	0	2	6.5	2	4.1	0	0	4	1.6
SRSS	3	3.6	3	5.6	4	12.9	3	6.1	4	11.8	17	6.8

[from Switzer 1977]

Table 48.

Number and Percentage of Users of Each of Nine Sets of Materials, by State

	California N = 288		Colorado N = 235		Connecticut N = 277		Texas N = 180		Total N = 980	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
American Political Behavior (Indiana)	34	12	14	6	25	9	21	12	94	10
Asian Studies Inquiry Program (Berkeley)	15	5	12	5	11	4	0	0	38	4
Episodes in Social Inquiry (SRSS)	13	5	22	9	16	6	9	5	60	6
Geography in An Urban Age (HSGP)	17	6	26	11	12	4	0	0	55	6
Holt Social Studies Series (Carnegie)	48	17	35	15	43	16	12	7	138	14
Justice in Urban America Series (Law in Am Soc.)	20	9	18	8	25	9	4	2	67	7
Patterns in Human History (ACSP)	7	2	9	4	19	7	1	1	36	4
Public Issues Series (Harvard)	37	13	19	8	44	18	6	3	106	12
Units in American History (Amherst)	11	4	17	7	24	9	4	2	56	6

[from Turner and Haley 1977)

2) The extent of use of the "new social studies" materials is rather low. Only one study reported more than 50 percent of respondents were using the materials, and that was only a smidgin over the 50 percent mark.

3) No single package received anything near a 50 percent usage rating; the use percentages are distributed among ten packages.

The low use rates should not be too surprising, perhaps, when one considers two other findings from surveys of materials awareness and usage. Both of these findings give us an image of social studies as a relatively fragmented field.

First, the EPIE Institute (Report of a National Study . . . 1977) found that, in contrast to science, mathematics, and reading, there is no single materials package or small group of materials packages that dominates the market in social studies. (Only two out of 66 materials packages in social studies were used by more than ten percent of the respondents in their survey; each of the two was used by 10.5 percent of the respondents. In science, three out of 102 packages were used by over ten percent of respondents, one receiving 16.9 percent of the "vote." In mathematics, five out of 74 packages were each used by over ten percent, with the highest 21.1 percent. In reading, one set of materials was used by a whopping 31.7 percent of respondents; in all, 11 out of 66 packages were each used by more than ten percent of the respondents.) The EPIE survey did not identify the materials, unfortunately, so we have no indication of the relative extent of use of "new social studies" versus other social studies materials. All we know from the EPIE report is that there appears to be significant dispersion in materials usage in social studies as compared to other fields.

Second, at least two studies (Turner and Haley 1975; Switzer et al. 1974) found that use rates increased substantially if one controlled for subject matter taught by the respondents. That is, the proportion of users of new geography materials such as HSGP was much higher among teachers who were teaching geography than among social studies teachers in general. Thus specialization--

another word for fragmentation--may set some limits to the extent of dissemination and impact one can expect any one package of materials to have.

Additional information on classroom impact of project materials comes from Gross's recent survey (1977). It is worth quoting Gross at length:

> As to teaching methodology, the foregoing studies* also found teachers reporting that they are using the approaches construed to be associated with the new social studies, particularly inquiry, conceptual, broad-field, and simulation-game approaches. Our respondents [national sample of district social studies supervisors] also agree that teaching styles have been materially influenced by the new social studies projects. Over 3/4 of them believe this is clearly apparent in the secondary schools, and about 60 per cent feel there has been an average-to-great impact upon elementary school practices. If this is so, we should be experiencing a virtual Renaissance in social studies instruction. Do we have further evidence on this?
>
> Our respondents, however, reported that the new social studies projects have had minimal influence on textbook selection, the employment of teachers, and upon teacher training. They also indicate a very limited use of the new projects in the schools. This reflects the common knowledge that the sales of many of these programs have been far below the expectations of their developers and publishers. Our responses from the state and district levels closely parallel one another in indicating which of the newer programs they believe have had the greatest influence in their areas; but it seems that the impact of no single program was particularly significant. (See Table VI.)
>
> Cne of the California studies previously cited certainly supports this view. Here, in spite of the fact that the bulk of the high school teachers claimed that they are employing the methodology of the new social studies, over 70 per cent of the sampling admitted little direct teaching of skill development. In this study 90 randomly selected high school social studies instructors in a large and cosmopolitan county reported that they are not using the new social studies projects to any considreable extent. Indeed, Britton found, for example, that 27 per cent had never heard of the Amherst Project; 33 per cent had never heard of Law in a Free Society; 43 per cent had never heard of Sociological Resources for Secondary School Social Studies; 46 per cent had never heard of the High School Geography Project; 53 percent had never heard of Patterns in Human History; and 56 percent had never heard of Econ 12 or American Political Behavior--in spite of the fact that the majority were seasoned

---

*Gordon Stanton, Teachers Look at Secondary Social Studies Teaching, School of Education, California State College, San Bernardino (Mimeographed survey report), May 1976, 37 p. See also Helen Britton, "Diffusion of Social Studies Innovation in Santa Clara County, California," unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, August 1976.

Table VI
Which Projects Had Most Impact
in Your State/System?
(In Order of Frequency of Mention)

--High School Geography Project (S)*
--Carnegie-Mellon History Project (S)
--Sociological Resources for Secondary Schools (S)
--American Political Behavior (S)
--Harvard Paperbacks (S)
--MACOS (E)**
--TABA Social Studies Program (E)
--Our Working World (E)
--People and Technology (E)
--Minnesota Family of Man (E)
--Anthropology Curriculum Project (S)
--Legal Programs (E/S)

*(S)--Secondary Level
**(E)--Elementary Level

teachers, and over 30 per cent reported belonging to local, state, or national social studies councils. Less than ten per cent of all of her respondents had tried one of the projects listed, and the list included more than those mentioned above.

Thus we face a perplexing dilemma. If teachers are using new social studies methodologies and are not deeply involved in the new programs or influenced directly by them, what accounts for their familiarity with the procedures? Could it be their professional reading? Absolutely not! Over 90 per cent of our district respondents claim that professional social studies literature has but average-to-little influence upon either elementary or secondary school instruction. Stanton found even more depressing information from the teachers themselves. Only 15 per cent of his sampling belong to social studies organizations, and only 13 per cent reported using social studies journals. Nevertheless, one way or another, at least the terminology of the new social studies has percolated to the teachers. Yet we have conflicint evidence as to actual practice. Undoubtedly, however, from discovery techniques and case studies to role playing and pupil action-research within the community, aspects of the new social studies are found in many classrooms and school situations today. Conventional textbooks of the present era, curriculum guides, and inservice education programs have incorporated and emphasize important elements of the new social studies. Perhaps large numbers of children and youth are being exposed to and involved in timely and revitalized socio-civic education. Our study and other critiques and research, however, lead us to seriously question such conclusions. This is an area ripe for thorough examination. We all know that new content approached in tired ways soon loses its glamor, or that instruction about problems can be very different from involvement in problem inquiry. Large-scale investigation as to just what is going on in schoolrooms, both in content and techniques, is still badly needed.

As Gross points out, no studies have been done on the question of how the materials are actually used in the classroom. Some questionnaire surveys have asked for user's rankings of the success of materials they have put into practice (Turner and Haley 1977; Morrissett 1973. 1975a, 1975b). These have generally found respondents to favor the new materials over others. Beyond this information, we know very little else about the impact of the "new social studies."

Summary Observations

1) There are some differing perceptions of what the characteristics of the "new social studies" are, although a few "core" characteristics appear to be generally agreed upon:

    a) emphasis on the social science disciplines;

    b) emphasis on the "structure" of the disciplines (concepts, generalizations, theories, models);

    c) emphasis on the methodologies of the disciplines;

    d) emphasis on inquiry/inductive/discovery strategies of instruction;

    e) emphasis on materials as the heart of the instructional improvement effort (provision of comprehensive teaching guides, variety of media, and packages containing all essential materials);

    f) emphasis on role of scholars in curriculum development; and,

    g) emphasis on multiple cycles of development, fieldtesting, and revision in the curriculum development process.

2) A host of criticisms of the "new social studies" have been offered over the last decade. They are related to:

    a) the inquiry/discovery/inductivemethods of instruction used in the "new social studies";

    b) the content of the "new social studies";

    c) the objectives and rationale of the "new social studies" and its place in the social studies curriculum scope and sequence;

    d) the needs and characteristics of users of the "new social studies";

    e) the developers of the "new social studies";

f) evaluation in ad of the "new social studies";

g) the cost of the "new social studies" programs;

h) the "new social studies" as a "new orthodoxy";

i) gimmickry in the "new social studies"; and,

j) dissemination of the "new social studies."

3) Very little "hard data" is available on the impact of the "new social studies." There have been no systematic studies of the influence of the "new social studies" on publishers of curriculum materials. There have been two surveys of methods professors' attitudes toward the "new social studies." The few studies on the extent of use of "new social studies" materials show that they are not widely used. There have been no studies examining the quality of actual classroom use of the materials.

References

Abrams, Grace C., and Frances Schmidt. 1971. Minorities in American Society: Social Studies. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools.

Academic Freedom. May 1967. Social Education, 31(5): 425.

Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher: A Policy Statement of the National Council for the Social Studies. April 1971. Social Education, 35(4): 378-380.

Academic Freedom: A Policy Statement. November 1967. Social Education, 31(7): 605.

Adelson, Nancy C., and Sandra G. Crosby. 1971. The American Government Information Unit: Curriculum Alternatives for Secondary Schools. Berkeley, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
ED 052 114.

Alexander, Albert. March 1969. Does the American History Textbook Still Wear a Gray Flannel Cover? Social Education, 33(3): 300-305, 324.

Alexander, Albert. January 1960. The Gray Flannel Cover on the American History Textbook. Social Education, 24(1): 11-14.

Alilunas, Leo J. June 1965. Some Implications of Research Findings about Secondary School Social Studies Teaching as an Occupation. Journal of Teacher Education, 16:247-48.

Alilunas, Leo J. September 3, 1963. The Image of Public Schools in Roman Catholic American History Textbooks. History of Education Quarterly, 159-165.

Alilunas, Leo J. May 1958. Bestor and the "Social Studies." Social Education, 22(5): 238-240.

Allen, Jack. February 1967. Assessing Recent Developments in the Social Studies. Social Education, 31(2): 99-103.

Allen, Michael Geoffrey. 1973. A Descriptive Survey of the Preparation of Secondary School Social Studies Teachers in Selected Institutions in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maine. (DA 34/07-A: 4050)

American Council of Learned Societies and the National Council for the Social Studies. 1962. The Social Studies and the Social Sciences. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

American History (American Studies). 1970. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Curriculum Development. ED 043 538.

The American Way: Rules, Law and You: An Assessment of Law-Related Competencies. 1976. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education. ED 098 134.

Analysis of Standardized Testing Program Results 1973-74: Grades 1, 5, and 8 and ACT Report. 1974. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education, Evaluation, Assessment, and Testing Unit. ED 098 264.

Analysis of Statewide Testing Program Results, 1972-1973. Grades 1, 5, and 8 and ACT Report 1973. 1973. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education. ED 079 421.

Anderson, Astrid C. 1966. The Treatment of Racial and Cultural Diversity in Elementary School Social Studies Textbooks. In *The Development of Instructional Materials Pertaining to Race and Culture in America*, Cooperative Research Project No. H-199. Medford, MA: Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University.

Anderson, Lawrence Conrad. 1968. An Analysis of the Academic Preparation and Teaching Assignment of Idaho High School Social Studies Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Idaho, Moscow, ID. (DA 29/06-A: 1799)

Anderson, Scarvia B., et al. 1964. *Social Studies in Secondary Schools: A Survey of Courses and Practices*. Princeton, NJ: Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service.

Anthony, Albert S. November 1967. The Role of Objectives in the "New History." *Social Education*, 31(7): 574-590.

Arnsdorf, V.E. January 1963. Readability of Basal Social Studies Materials. *Reading Teacher*, 16: 243-46.

Arrington, James Donald. 1972. Analysis of Ecological Content in Elementary Social Studies Textbooks Adopted by the State of Indiana for Grades Three Through Six. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Asia Society. 1976. *Asia in American Textbooks: An Evaluation*. New York, NY: Asia Society. ED 124 439.

Awkard, Joseph Cyrus, Jr. 1964. The Incidence and Treatment of Human Behavior Concepts in Upper Elementary School Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA. (DA 25/06: 3385)

Bachus, Gordon Scott. 1972. An Analysis of the Academic Preparation, Teaching Assignment, and Professionalism of Selected Social Studies Teachers in Secondary Schools in Arkansas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, AR. (DA 33/05-A: 2207)

Bagley, Earl G. Bagley. 1974. Simulation Game Research at the Early Elementary Level. Social Education, 38(3): 288-290.

Bailey, Lo. C., and F. J. Clune, Jr. November 1965. Anthropology in Elementary Social Studies. Instructor, 75: 48-50.

Baker, G. Derwood. 1960. Economic Education. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3d ed., Chester W. Harris, ed., p. 398-403. New York, NY: Macmillan/AERA.

Banks, James Albert. 1969. A Content Analysis of Elementary American History Textbooks: The Treatment of the Negro and Race Relations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Baringer, Richard Lawrence. 1969. Inquiry Differences in Selected Current Senior High School United States History Textbooks and an Instrument for Their Comparative Evaluation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, TN.

Barlow, Janelle Mary Schlimgen. 1973. The Images of the Chinese, Japanese and Koreans in American Secondary School World History Textbooks, 1900-1970. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Barnes, Buckley R., and Elmer U. Clawson. 1975. Do Advance Organizers Facilitate Learning? Recommendations for Further Research Based on an Analysis of 32 Studies. Review of Educational Research, 45(4): 637-659.

Barnes, Donald L. October 1960. What Are We Teaching In Social Studies and Science? Education, 81: 121-123.

Barr, Robert D. April 1973. Beyond the "New" Social Studies. The Social Studies, 64(4): 157-159.

Barth, James L., and S. Samuel Shermis. November 1970. Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions. Social Education, 34(8): 743-751.

Baum, Milton S. 1975. Economic Education in California Public Schools. Sacramento, DA: California State Department of Education.

Becker, James M. January 1965. Prospect for Change in the Social Studies. Social Education, 29(1): 20-22,31.

Benjamin, James M. February 1975. What Have We Done to Social Studies? Social Education, 39(2): 88, 90.

Berelson, Bernard. 1962. Introduction. In The Social Studies and the Social Sciences, American Council of Learned Societies and National Council for the Social Studies. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Bergstrom, Rosemary, and Paul A. Olson. 1975. A Time Half Dead at the Top: The Professional Societies and the Reform of Schooling in America, 1955-75. Lincoln, NE: Study Committee on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers.

Berkwits, Jory. January 1973. The "New" Social Studies: Its Shortcomings and Its Prospects. The Social Studies, 64(1): 17-19.

Berlin, William Oliver. 1972. An Analysis of Selected Elementary School Textbooks to Determine the Extent of Inclusion of the Anthropological Concept of Cultural Relativity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN.

Berman, Marvin Herschel. 1975. The Treatment of the Soviet Union and Communism in Selected World History Textbooks, 1920-1970. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Besonen, Philip John. 1972. An Analysis of Social Science Requirements in the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers with a Comparison of Randomly Selected and Social Studies Leader Teacher Training Institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT. (DA 33/06-A: 2797)

Bestor, Arthur. 1955. The Restoration of Learning: A Program for Redeeming the Unfulfilled Promise of American Education. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Billington, Ray Allen, et al. 1966. The Historian's Contribution to Anglo-American Misunderstanding: Report of a Committee on National Bias in Anglo-American History Textbooks. New York, NY: Hobbs, Dorman.

Black Studies: Related Learning Materials and Activities in Social Studies for Kindergarten, Grade 1 and Grade 2. 1970. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Curriculum Development. ED 051 351.

Black, Watt Lesley. 1963. The Undergraduate Content Background of Secondary Social Studies Teachers: An Evaluation as Related to Teaching Assignments Accepted. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL. (DA 24/11: 4564)

Blesh, Robert Heltman. 1969. A Study of the Practices of Social Studies Teachers in Selected Texas Elementary Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, TX. (DA 30/11-A: 4870-71)

Block, James H. 1974. Mastery Learning in the Classroom: An Overview of Recent Research. In Schools, Society, and Mastery Learning, James H. Block, ed., pp. 27-69. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bragaw, Donald H. 1974. Social Studies Survey. Unpublished report, State Department of Education, Albany, NY.

Brubaker, Dale L., Lawrence H. Simon, and Jo Watts Williams, March 1977. A Conceptual Framework for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction. *Social Education*, 41(3): 201-205.

Brufke, Edward F. 1972. Critical Analysis of Multi-disciplinary Terms in Representative High School United States History Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL. (DA 33/06: 2687-A)

Bruns, Richard F., and Alexander Frazier. May 1957. A Survey of Elementary School Social Studies Program. *Social Education*, 21: 202-204.

Bryant, Joyce Elaine. 1971. An Investigation of the Reading Levels of High School Students with the Readability Levels of Certatin Content Textbooks with Their Costs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

Cadugan, William Hayden. 1958. An Analysis of Economic Geography Textbooks from 1891 through 1956. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, PA. (DA 19/01: 81-82)

Campbell, Elwood G. April 1964. Status of Advanced Placement American History Courses in Secondary Schools. *Social Education*. 28(4): 212-213, 224.

Campbell, Vincent N., et al. 1971. *National Assessment of Educational Progress. 1969-70 Citizenship: Group Results for Sex, Region, and Size of Community*. Denver, CO: Education Comission of the States. ED 063 196.

Career Education: A Position Paper on Career Development and Preparation in California. 1974. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Carp, Robert A. May 1968. Censorship Pressures on Social Studies Teachers. *Social Education*, 32(5): 487-488.

Carpenter, Helen McCracken, ed. 1963. *Skill Development in Social Studies*. 33rd Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Carr, Edwin R., Edgar B. Wesley, and Wilbur F. Murra. 1950. Social Studies. In *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 2d ed., Walter S. Monroe, ed., pp. 1213-1238. New York, NY: American Educational Research Association/ Macmillan. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Carter, Joe Luther. 1971. Analysis and Problems of Explanation in Social Studies Classrooms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urban, IL. (DA 32/10-A: 5667-5668)

Causey, Clarence Richard, Jr. 1971. A Comparative Study of the Reading Difficulty of Selected Social Studies Textbooks and the *McGuffey Eclectic Readers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Chacko, Cherukattu Abraham. 1970. An Evaluation of the Treatment of India in Selected American Secondary School World History Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Chapin, June R. 1974. *Social Studies Dissertations: 1969-1973*. Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC. ED 098 085.

Chapin, June R., and Richard E. Gross. April 1972. Making Sense out of the Terminology of the New Social Studies. *The Social Studies*, 63(4): 147-155.

Chapin, June R., and Richard E. Gross. November 1970. A Barometer of the Social Studies: Three Decades of *Social Education*. *Social Education,* 34(8): 788-795.

Chapman, Katherine, et al. 1974. *Simulation/Games in Social Studies: What Do We Know*? Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC. ED 093 736.

Chase, W.L., and G.M. Wilson. April 1958. Preference Studies in Elementary School Social Studies. *Journal of Education*, 140: 1-28.

Cherryholmes, C.H. 1966. Some current research on effectiveness of educational simulations: Implications for alternative strategies. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 10: 4-7.

Chesler, Mark. 1967. Values and Controversy in Secondary Social Studies: A Critical Review of the Literature. In *Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal*, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chap. 13. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Chew, Victoria. 1966. Social Sciences Generalizations in Selected Second Grade Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, CA. (DA 27/08: 2438-A)

Citizenship: An Interdisciplinary Study of Man, Society, and Culture. 1974. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Department of Education.

Citizenship and Social Studies 1975-1976: Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program. 1976. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Department of Education.

Claugus, Jean Tilford. March 1976. The Fourth "R." *Social Education*, 40(3): 150-152.

Clubok, Arthur Sheldon. 1969. The Use of Critical Thinking by Twelfth-Grade Civics Teachers in the Detroit Public Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. (DA 30/09-A: 3629)

The Code of Ethnics of the Education Profession. May 1964. *Social Education*, 28(5): 255-256.

Committee on Academic Freedom (NCSS). December 1956. Action to Uphold Freedom to learn and Freedom to Teach. *Social Education*, 20(8): 371-372, 374.

Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, American Political Science Association. Summer 1971. Political Education in the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science. PS, 4(3): 431-457.

Conant, James B. 1959. The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Consumer Education in the Secondary Curriculum: Guidelines for Implementation. 1972. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, Bureau of General and Academic Education. ED 065 409.

Contact: An Open-Ended Guide to the Social Studies, Grades 1-6. 1975. Gallup, NM: Gallup-McKinley County Public Schools.

Cottrell, Victor Allen. 1967. Team Teaching in the Senior High School Social Studies of Selected Schools in the Area Served by the North Central Association. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, Lincoln, NE. (DA 28/09-A: 3550)

Cousins, Jack E. 1967. State History: The Reign of Provincialism. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chap. 5. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Cox, C. Benjamin. 1967. American History: Chronology and the Inquiry Process. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massilas, eds., Chap. 4. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Cox, C. Benjamin, Emily S. Girault, and Lawrence E. Metcalf. 1966. Review of Research in Social Studies 1965. Social Education, 30(5): 348-359. Reprinted in Oswald 1972. ED 083 058.

Cox, C. Benjamin, and William D. Johnson. 1972. Review of Search [sic] in Social Studies--1970. Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, 25(2): 5-67. EJ 070 575.

Cox, C. Benjamin, William D. Johnson, and Roland Payette. 1968. Review of Research in Social Studies: 1967. Social Education, 32(6): 557-571. Reprinted in Oswald 1972. ED 083 058.

Cox, Benjamin C., and Byron G. Massialas. 1967. Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Crane, Robert. 1974. The First Social Studies Assessment: An Overview. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, National Assessment of Educational Progress. ED 095 060.

Cremer, Robert D. 1963. An Analysis of the Development of High School World History Textbooks and Enrollments from 1900 to 1959. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD. (DA 24/10: 4051)

Crosby, Sandra G., ed. 1973. Secondary Social Studies Information Unit: A Review and Analysis of Curriculum Alternatives. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Information/Utilization Division. ED 081 699.

Cruikshanks, Andrew Norman. 1957. The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary School 1893-1955. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University Stanford, CA.

Cummings, John Philip. 1971. The Analysis and Evaluation of Affective Objectives in Recent Social Studies Curriculum Projects for the Senior High School. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Curriculum Guide, Grades 4-7. 1968. Providence, RI: Providence Social Studies Curriculum Project.

Curriculum Guide to Social Studies, Grades 4-6. 1976. Indianapolis, IN: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. ED 051 176.

Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education: Position Statement. 1976. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Davis, James E. 1977. Needed Materials in Precollege Economic Education. In Perspectives on Economic Education, Donald R. Wentworth, W. Lee Hansen, and Sharryl H. Hawke, eds. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, National Council for the Social Studies, and Joint Council on Economic Education.

Davison, Donald G., et al. 1975. Economics in Social Studies Textbooks: An Evaluation of the Economics and the Teaching Strategies in Social Studies Textbooks, Elementary Grades (1-6). Report No. 2. Iowa City, IA: Iowa University, Bureau of Business and Economic Research. ED 114 342.

Davison, Donald G., John H. Kilgore, and Larry G. Sgontz. 1973. Economics in Social Studies Textbooks: An Evaluation of the Economics and the Teaching Strategies in Social Studies Textbooks, Elementary Grades (1-6). New York, NY: Joint Council on Economic Education.

Dawson, George G. 1970. A Supplement to Research in Economic Education: A Bibliography. New York, NY: New York University, Center for Economic Education. ED 043 535.

Dawson, George G. 1969. Research in Economic Education: A Bibliography. New York, NY: New York University, Center for Economic Education. ED 043 534.

Desoto Parish Curriculum Guide: Civics. 1971. Natchitoches, LA: Desoto Parish School Board.

Dickson, Jan. 1972. An Analysis of Eleven Social Studies Projects Using Two Analytical Systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT.

Dimitroff, L. November 1961. Quantitative-Qualitative Analysis of Selected Social Science Generalizations in Social Studies Textbooks in the Intermediate Grades. Journal of Educational Research, 55: 135-137.

Dimitroff, Lillian M. 1958. A Quantitative-Qualitative Analysis of Selected Social Science Generalizations in Social Studies Textbooks in the Intermediate Grades. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Dimond, Stanley E. 1960. Citizenship Education. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3d ed., Chester W. Harris, ed., pp. 206-210. New York, NY: Macmillan and American Educational Research Association.

A Directory of Social Studies Projects. October 1967. Social Education, 31(6): 509-511.

Dorow, Ernest Baxter. 1966. An Analysis of the Objectives and Content of Ninth Grade Social Studies Textbooks and Local Courses of Study as Related to Pennsylvania State Courses of Study: 1925-1965. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Draper, Wallace Dean. 1970. An Analysis of Advanced Placement American History Programs in Selected Illinois Public Secondary Schools, 1969. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL. (DA 31/10-A: 5029)

Duggal, Pratkash Vati. 1969. The Treatment of India in Selected American Social Studies Textbooks, 1953-68. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Dunfee, Maxine. 1970. Elementary School Social Studies: A Guide to Current Research. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ED 043 552.

Durham, Kenneth Reuben, Jr. 1971. A Survey of All American History Textbooks Adopted for the Public High Schools of Texas from 1919 to 1970. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, TX.

Dusenbery, Miriam Cain. 1964. Analysis of Selected Features of Older and Newer Editions of Certain Revisions of Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Grader Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

Dynneson, Thomas L. 1975a. Dealing with a Dilemma: Distinguishing Anthropology Materials from Other Pre-Collegiate Social Studies Materials. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Dynneson, Thomas L. 1975b. *Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project. ED 114 357.

Dynneson, Thomas Lowell. 1972. Anthropology for the Schools: An Analysis of Selected Anthropology Curriculum Projects and Units with Content Ratings by Professional Anthropologists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. (DA 33/08-A: 3948)

East Syracuse-Minoa Schools Environmental Education Materials. 1973. East Syracuse, NY: East Syracuse-Minoa Central Schools. ED 101 945.

Economic Education in the Schools: Report of the National Task Force on Economic Education. 1961. New York, NY: Committee for Economic Development.

Edgerton, Ronald B. March 1969. Odyssey of a Book: How a Social Studies Text Comes Into Being. *Social Education*, 33(3): 279-286.

Edgerton, Stephenie G. May 1967. "Learning" by Introduction. *Social Education*. 31(5): 373-377.

Ediger, Marlow. April 1964. Social Studies in the Elementary School. *Social Education*, 28(4): 201.

Edson, D.H. 1976. *Why Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores Are Falling*. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon. ED 121 856.

Education for Citizenship: A Bicentennial Survey. 1976. Denver, CO: National Assessment of Educational Progress. S) 009 824.

Ehman, Lee H. 1977. Research on Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction: Values. In *Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975*. Francis P. Hunkins et al., pp. 55-95. Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC; and Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. SO 009 758.

The Elementary School Curriculum: Citizenship Education. 1955. Albany, NY: New York State Education Department.

Elish, Raymond Daniel. 1973. An Analysis of Secondary School Social Studies Methods Courses in Ohio Colleges and Universities, 1973. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, OH. (DA 35/01-A: 296)

Ellenwood, Stephan Edward. 1970. A Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis of Depictions of Violence in Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Ellis, Joseph R. September 1961. Relationships Between Aspects of Preparation of Measures of Performance of Secondary Teachers of the Social Studies. *Journal of Educational Research*, 55: 24-28.

Ellis, Joseph V. October 1971. A Philosophical Analysis of the "New" Social Studies. *The Social Studies*, 62(5): 195-203.

Ellsworth, Ruth. 1962. Trends in Organization of the Social Studies. In *Social Studies in Elementary Schools*, John U. Michaelis, ed., Chapter IV. 32nd Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Engle, Shirley H. 1976. Will the Real Social Studies Please Stand Up? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, DC.

Engle, Shirley. 1965. Objectives of the Social Studies. In *New Challenges in the Social Studies*, B.G. Massialas and F.R. Smith, ets., Chapter 1. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Engle, Shirley H. November 1960. Decision Making: The Heart of Social Studies Instruction. *Social Education*, 24(7): 301-304, 306.

Epstein, Charlotte. 1956. The Concept of Supremacy of Law in Educating for Democratic Citizenship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. (DA 16/05: 896)

Eulie, Joseph. January 1969. Structure and Strategies in the New Social Studies--An Evaluation. *Journal of Secondary Education*, 44(1): 12-18.

Exemplar: A Model for Social Studies Curriculum Development in Delaware, K-12. 1970. Dover, DE: Delaware State Department of Public Instruction. ED 051 165.

Fair, Jean. 1965. Research in the Education of Social Studies Teachers. *Social Education*, 29(1): 15-22, 31.

Feely, Ted, Jr. 1976. Critical Thinking: Toward a Definition, Paradigm and Research Agenda. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 4(1): 1-19.

Fell, David J. 1975. An Analytic Survey of Secondary Social Studies Teacher Academic Preparation Programs in Ohio's Teacher Education Institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, OH. (DA 36/09-A: 6014)

Fenton, Edwin, and John M. Good. April 1965. Project Social Studies: A Progress Report. *Social Education*, 29(4): 206-208.

Fernández,Celestino, Grace Carroll Massey, and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1975. *High School Students' Perceptions of Social Studies*. Occasional Paper No. 6. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University. ED 113-241.

Fersh, George L. 1955. *The Problems Approach and the Social Studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Finkelstein, Barbara, Loretta Golden, and Jean Dresden Grambs. March 1969. A Bibliography of Research and Commentary on Textbooks and Related Works. *Social Education*, 33(3): 331-336.

Fitzgerald, James Michael. 1969. World of Work Content in the Social Studies at the Elementary School Level. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

Fletcher, J.L. 1971. The effectiveness of simulation games as learning environments: A proposed program of research. *Simulation and Games*, 2: 473-488.

Focus on Man: A Prospectus, Social Studies for Utah Schools. 1971. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Board of Education. ED 053 383.

Fort Benton Social Studies Curriculum Outline. 1970. Fort Benton, MT: Fort Benton Public Schools. ED 062 034.

Foshay, Arthur W. March 1970. How Fare the Disciplines? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 51(7): 352.

Fox, Thomas Earl. 1972. The Treatment of Social Conflict in Social Studies Textbooks for Grades Three, Five and Nine. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Fox, T.E., and R.D. Hess. 1972. *An Analysis of Social Conflict in Social Studies Textbooks*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, California School of Education. ED 076 493.

Framework for the Social Studies in Wyoming, Grades K-12: A Guide for Curriculum Development. 1969. Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming State Department of Education. ED 050 068.

Framework for the Social Studies, Grades K-12. 1970. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency. ED 044 327.

Fraser, Dorothy McClure. 1968. The Changing Scent in Social Studies. In *Social Studies Curriculum Development: Prospects and Problems*, D.M. Fraser, ed., Chapter 1. 39th Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. ED 039 154.

Fraser, Dorothy M. November 1965. Status and Expectations of Current Research and Development Projects. *Social Education*, 29(7): 421-434.

Fraser, Dorothy M. 1957. Organization of the Elementary and School Social Studies Curriculum. In *Social Studies in the Elementary School*, National Society for Study of Education Yearbook, Nelson B. Henny, ed., pt. 2: 129-162. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fraser, Dorothy McClure, and Samuel P. McCutchen, eds. 1965. *Social Studies in Transition: Guidelines for Change*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Frost, Jess V. February 1974. A Problem of Bias: Soviet and U.S. Distortion of History. *Social Studies*, 65(2): 58-61.

Fundamentals of the Free Enterprise System: Course Guide. 1975. Austin, TX: Division of Curriculum Development, Texas Education Agency.

Furman, Dorothy. 1962. Content, Trends, and Topics in the Social Studies. In Social Studies in Elementary Schools, John U. Michaelis, ed., Chapter 3, 32nd Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Gandy, Willard E. February 1965. Instructional Patterns and Materials in the Teaching of Geography. Journal of Geography, 64(2): 72-77.

Gibson, John S. October 1965. The Big Revolution in Social Studies. Grade Teacher, 83: 84-5+.

Gilbert, John Henry. 1955. Changes of the Twentieth Century in the Treatment of Foreign Affairs since 1865 by United States History Textbooks for the Seventh and Eighth Grades. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

Gillespie, Judith A. July 1975. The American Government Course: Relationships Between High School and College Instruction. Teaching Political Science, 2(4): 381-408.

Girault, Emily S. 1967. Psychology and Sociology: The Study of Human Behavior. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chapter 11. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Girault, Emily S., and C. Benjamin Cox. 1967. Review of Research in Social Studies: 1966. Social Education, 31(5): 388-396, 404. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Glass, Gene V. 1976. Primary, Secondary, and Meta-Analysis of Research. Educational Researcher, 5(10): 3-8.

Godbold, John Vance. 1968. Oral Questioning Practices of Teachers in Social Studies Classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL. (DA 30/05-A: 1912-1913)

Godwin, Charles Marion. 1967. Contemporary Practices in Selected Nebraska Elementary School Social Studies Programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, Lincoln, NE. (DA 28/08-A: 3555)

Golden, Loretta. September 1966. The Treatment of Minority Groups in Primary Social Studies Textbooks. Interracial Review.

Golden, Loretta. 1964. The Treatment of Minority Groups in Primary Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Goldstein, Robert J. Undated. The Elementary School Curriculum and Political Socialization. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Grannis, Joseph C. 1970. The Social Studies Teacher and Research on Teacher Education. Social Education, 34(3): 291-301, 315.

Gray, Roland F. February 1964. Teaching About Communism: A Survey of Objectives. Social Education. 28(2): 71-70.

Greco, Peter V. 1967. Geography: Understanding Man in a Changing World. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chapter 12. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Griswold, W.J. 1975. The Image of the Middle East in Secondary School Textbooks. New York, NY: Middle East Studies Association of North America. ED 117 013.

Gross, Richard E. March 1977. The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey. Social Education, 41(3): 194-200, 205.

Gross, Richard E. April 1952. What's Wrong with American History? Social Education, 16(4): 157-161.

Gross, Richard E., and Dwight W. Allen. March 1967. Problems and Practices in Social Studies Education. Social Education, 31(3): 207-208, 211.

Gross, Richard E., and William V. Badger. 1960. Social Studies. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd ed., Chester W. Harris, ed., pp. 1296-1319. New York, NY: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Gross, Richard E., and Leonardo De La Cruz. 1971. Social Studies Dissertations: 1963-1969. Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS. ED 054 999.

Gross, Richard E., and Fred J. MacDonald. 1958. The Problem Solving Approach. Phi Delta Kappan, 39: 259-265.

Guenther, John, and Wayne Dumas. 1973. Teacher Familiarity with and Use of Project Social Studies Materials in the Midwest. Educational Leadership, 39: 641-643.

A Guide for Instruction in the Social Studies. 1955. Curriculum Bulletin No. 17. St. Paul, MN: St. Paul, Minnesota Department of Education.

A Guide to Content in the Social Studies: Report of the NCSS Committees on Concepts and Values. 1957. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Guidelines for the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers. October 1967. Social Education, 31(6): 490-491.

Haas, John D. 1977. The Era of the New Social Studies. Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC. SO 009 662.

Haffner, Hyman. 1959. A Study of Vocabulary Load and Social-Concept Burden of Fifth and Sixth Grade Social Studies, History, and Geography Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Hahn, Carole L. 1977a. Familiarity with and Perceived Characteristics of "New Social Studies" Materials. In Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials, C.L. Hahn et al., Chapter 2. Boulder, CO: SSEC. SO 009 772.

Hahn, Carole L. 1977b. Research on the Diffusion of Social Studies Innovations. In Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975, Francis P. Hunkins et al., Chapter 5. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, and Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC. SO 009 758.

Hahn, Harlan, February 1965. Teacher Preparation in Political Science. Social Education, 29(2): 86-89.

Haller, Elizabeth S. 1971. American Culture: What? Why? How? Harrisburgh, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

Handrick, Fannie A. 1975. Delaware Educational Assessment Program 1974-75. Report of the Spring 1975 Testing Program. Dover, DE: Delaware State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation. ED 118 608.

Harnischfeger, Annegret, and David E. Wiley. 1975. Achievement Test Score Decline: Do We Need to Worry? St. Louis, MO: ML-GROUP for Policy Studies in Education, CEMREL, Inc. ED 120 263.

Harris, J.J. June 1963. Intergroup Relations in Social Studies Textbooks. TIP, 2: 128-135.

Harris, Judah. 1963. The Treatment of Religion in Elementary School Social Studies Textbooks. New York, NY: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Harris, Nelson H. April 1969. The Treatment of Negroes in Books and Media Designed for the Elementary School. Social Education, 33(4): 434- 437.

Harrison, Sylvia E., and Robert J. Solomon. 1964. Review of Research in the Teaching of Social Studies: 1960-1963. Social Education, 28(5): 277-292. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Harrison, Sylvia E., and Robert J. Solomon. 1965. Review of Research in the Teaching of Social Studies: 1964. Social Education, 29(5): 281-290. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Hartley, James, and Ivor K. Davies. 1976. Preinstructional Strategies: The Role of Pretests, Behavioral Objectives, Overviews and Advance Organizers. Review of Educational Research, 46(2): 239-265.

Hartshorn, Merrill F. October 1961. Statement on HR 6774. Social Education, 25(6): 295-297.

Hartshorn, M.F. February 1957. Asia in Western Textbooks. NEA Journal, 46: 91-92.

Haslem, E.H. December 1955. Geography in Social Studies Textbooks for Grade Six. Journal of Geography, 54: 449-454.

Hata, Don, J., and Nadine I. Hata. 1974. I Wonder Where the Yellow Went? Distortions and Omissions of Asian Americans in California Education. Paper presented at 1974 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. ED 093 747.

Hawkins, M.L., and R.K. Templeton. Fall 1972. Teaching Social Studies to the Disadvantaged Elementary Pupil: Notes from the Research on Inductive Modes. Culture and Education, 4(3): 2-5.

Helper, John W. 1972. An Assessment of Learner Needs in Colorado, School Year 1970-1971. Denver, CO: Colorado State Department of Education. ED 068 514.

Henderson,William E. 1971. Introduction to Economics: Social Studies. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools.

Hering, William M., Jr. 1966. An Analysis of the Five Secondary School Textbooks in Sociology, Ann Arbor, MI: Sociological Resources for the Social Studies. (Unpublished paper--copy available in archives of Resources and Demonstration Center, Social Science Education Consortium, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO.)

Hermann, G.D. 1969. Learning by Discovery: A Critical Review of Studies. Journal of Experimental Education, 38(1): 58-72.

Hertzberg, Hazel W. 1971. Historial Parallels for the Sixties and Seventies: Primary Sources and Core Curriculum Revisited. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium. ED 051 066.

Hillestad, James T. 1965. A Study of the State University of Iowa Undergraduate Social Studies Teacher Education Program and Its Graduates, 1946-1961. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of Iowa, Ames, IA. (DA 26/05: 2575-2576)

Hines, Paul D. 1967. World History: The Growing Focus on World Cultures. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massilas, eds., Chapter 10. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Horner, Pearl John. 1975. A Content Analysis of Elementary Social Studies Textbooks to Determine Their Treatment of Career Information and Career Concepts Desired in Career Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM.

House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, 39th Congress, 2d Session. 1966. Books for Schools and the Treatment of Minorities. Hearings before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on De Facto School Segregation of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Howley, Mary Catherine. 1959. The Treatment of Religion in American History Textbooks for Grades Seven and Eight from 1783 to 1956. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York,NY.

Hunkins, Francis P., Lee H. Ehman, Carole L. Hahn, Pater H. Martorella, and Jan L. Tucker. Forthcoming 1977. *Review of Research in Social Studies Education, 1970-1975*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies; and Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/ Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium. SO 009 758.

Hunt, Raymond G., Stephen H. Davol, and Aileen Schoeppe. Spring 1972. Proposal for Precollege Psychology and Behavioral Science. *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology,* 2: 49. (American Psychological Association policy statement)

Hyman, Herbert H., Charles R. Wright, and John Shelton Reed. 1975. *The Enduring Effects of Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Irvin, Margaret Jean. 1967. A Survey of the Educational Preparation and Basic Problems of Social Studies Teachers in Selected Junior High Schools of the North Central Association Region, with Recommendations for Teacher Preparation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ. (DA 27/09-A: 2916-2917)

Israel, Jewel May Baldock. 1970. A Study of the Extent to Which Selected Social Science Concepts Are Included in Intermediate Grade Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS. (DA 31/11: 5668-A)

Janz, Margaret Louise. 1969. An Infestigation of the Reading Levels of Secondary School Students and the Readability Levels of Selected Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

Jarolimek, John. April 1973. In Pursuit of the Elusive New Social Studies. *Educational Leadership*, 30(7): 596-599.

Jarolimek, John. March 22, 1971. Unpublished speech given in Des Moines, IA. Cited by Desmond H. Bragg, Anatomy of the New Social Studies, in Social Studies for Behavioral Change: A Book of Readings in the New Social Studies, D.H. Bragg and S.J. Drumheller, eds., Chapter 1. Unpublished; based on presentations given at the midwest Regional Conference for the Social Studies, March 1970. ED 073 975.

Jarolimek, J., and C.D. Foster. May 1959. Quantitative Concepts in Fifth-grade Social Studies Textbooks. *Elementary School Journal*, 59: 437-442.

Jennings, M. Kent, and George B. Levenson. 1968. *Learning About Politics in American High Schools: A Progress Report on a National Survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research. ED 056 927.

Jensen, John Henry. 1969. An Investigation of Fourth and Sixth Grade Pupils' Understanding of Quantitative Concepts from Selected Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Jewett, Robert E., and Robert B. Ribble. January 1967. Curriculum Improvement and Teacher Status. *Social Education*, 31(1): 20-22.

Joekel, Ronald Gene. 1966. Grouping Practices and Procedures in Junior High School Social Studies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, Lincoln, NE. (DA 27/10-A: 3343-3344)

Johnson, Lynn Elliot. 1969. An Analysis of the Preparation of Secondary School Social Studies Teachers in Selected Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE. (DA 30/09-A: 3832)

Johnson, Lynne M., and John M. Finch. 1976. *South Carolina Statewide Testing Program, Fall, 1975: General Report*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina State Department of Education, Office of Research. ED 121 847.

Johnson, William D., Roland F. Payette, and C. Benjamin Cox. 1969. Review of Research in Social Studies: 1968. *Social Education*, 33(8): 965-989. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Jones, Richard John. 1971. Comparative Career Orientations of Beginning Male Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and English Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. (DA 32/11-A: 6042-6043)

Journal of School Psychology, Spring 1967, 5(3): special issue on teaching psychology and the behavioral sciences in the schools.

Joyce, Bruce R. 1967. The Primary Grades: A Review of Textbook Materials. In *Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal*, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chapter 2. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Joyce, William W. March 1973. Minorities in Primary-Grade Social Studies Textbooks: A Progress Report. *Social Education*, 37(3): 218-220.

Julianda, Lazara Valiente. 1969. An Analysis of Selected Forms of Graphic Presentation and Their Utilization in Elementary Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.

K-12 Social Studies Curriculum Guide. 1968. Reading, OH: Reading Community Schools. ED 051 180.

Kaltsounis, Theodore. November 1968. The Gap That Must Be Bridged. *Social Education*, 32(7): 699-703.

Kambayashi, Kikuko. 1975. The Expansion of Treatments of Japan in High School Textbooks in American History, 1951-1972. Comparative Education Dissertation Series, No. 26. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Kane, M.B. 1970. Minorities in Textbooks: A Study of Their Treatment in Social Studies Texts. New York, NY: Quadrangle Press, for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Kane, Paul Wayne. 1969. Contemporary Affairs Instruction in Selected High School Social Science Classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA. (DA 30/05-A: 1750)

Kardatzke, Howard, May/June 1975. Parent Scripts and Innovation in the Social Studies. The Social Studies, 66(3): 125-127.

Kasschau, Richard A., and Michael Wertheimer. 1974. Teaching Psychology in Secondary Schools. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, and Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS. ED 098 124.

Keller, Charles R. September 16, 1961. Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies. Saturday Review, 60-62.

Kennedy, Leonard M. 1960. The Treatment of Moslem Nations, India, and Israel in Social Studies Textbooks Used in Elementary and Junior High Schools of the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman, WA. (DA 21/03: 498-499)

Kenworthy, Leonard S. October 1962. Ferment in the Social Studies. Phi Delta Kappan, 44: 12-16.

Kimball, Elisabeth G. April 1970. A Survey of the Teaching of History and Social Studies in Secondary Schools. School and Society, 98 (2325): 246-249.

Kirby, Darrell Francis. 1964. Factors Relating to the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers in Selected Junior High Schools in Colorado. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. (DA 25/10: 5766)

Kirkendall, Richard S. September 1975. The Status of History in the Schools. Journal of American History, 62(2): 557-570.

Kirschenbaum. 1975. Recent Research in Values Clarification. In Values Education: Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, John Meyer, Brian Burnham, and John Cholvat, eds., pp. 71-78. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. May 1973. Moral Development and the New Social Studies. Social Education, 37(5): 369-375.

Kranyik, Robert Donald. 1965. A Comparison of the Images of Mexico Portrayed in Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Possessed by Connecticut and Mexican Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Krug, Mark M. October 1966 Burner's New Social Studies: A Critique. *Social Education*, 30(6): 400-406.

Krug, Mark. April 1961. On Rewriting the Story of Reconstruction in the United States History Textbooks. *Journal of Negro History*, 46: 133-153.

Kysilka, Marcella Louise. 1969. The Verbal Teaching Behaviors of Mathematics and Social Studies Teachers in Eighth and Eleventh Grades. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, TX. (DA 30/07-A: 2725)

Ladwig, Richard, and Spero McConnell. 1971. *Introduction to Psychology: Social Studies*. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools.

LaForse, Martin. December 1970. The New Social Studies Mania: Pause for Thought. *The Social Studies*, 61(8): 325-328.

Laner, Roy Herman. 1973. A Content Analysis of Selected Secondary School Economics Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, Muncie, IN.

Langhans, Elizabeth Jeremy. 1961. An Analysis of Current Social Study Texts, Grades Seven through Twelve, in Terms of Inclusion of Geographic Generalizations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. (DA 22/09: 3043)

Larkin, William Martin. 1969. An Analysis of Independent Study Programs in Selected Junior High Schools of Indiana. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. (DA 31/03-A: 930-931)

LaRoe, Margaret E. 1973. *Introduction to Anthropology: Social Studies*. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools. ED 093 731.

Lea, Hope Marilyn Halenbeck. 1964. A Study of Some Characteristics of the Variability of Teacher Activities in the Social Studies and Pupil Response and Achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN. (DA 26/05; 2590)

Lee, Marjorie. 1972. Cultural Pluralism and American Textbooks: A Study of the Chinese Immigrants in Oregon. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Lemmond, Lewis Earl. 1964. A Value Analysi of Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, Commerce, TX.

Lester, Thomas F. 1975. A Study of Preparation Programs for Secondary School Social Studies Teachers at Universities and Colleges of Montana. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Montana, Missoula, MT. (DA 36/09-A: 5869)

Lidberg, Richard George. 1965. Reading Comprehension Difficulties in Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grade Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.

Liftin, Elaine. 1971. *Social Studies: Our Federal Government*. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools. ED 062 235.

Loui, Beatrice. 1972. *Summary Report of Minimum Testing Program 1970-1971*. Evaluation Report No. 80. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii State Department of Education, Office of Instruction Services. ED 079 408.

Lunstrum, John P. February 1968. Anthropology: Pre-Service Teacher Education and Certification. *Social Education*, 32: 135-141.

Lunstrum, John P. 1965. Controversial Issues in Social Studies Instruction, In *New Challenges in the Social Studies*. B.G. Massialas and F.R. Smith, eds., Chapter 5. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lunstrum, John P. April 1962. Controversial Issues, School Policies, and Reflective Thinking: Part I. *Social Education*, 26(4): 189-192.

Lunstrum, John P. May 1962. Controversial Issues, School Policies, and Reflective Thinking: Part II. *Social Education*, 26(5): 244-246, 274.

Lunstrum, John P., and Bob L. Taylor. 1977. *Teaching Reading in the Social Studies*. Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC. SO 009 719.

Lux, John E. October 1962. A Comparison of Teaching Methods Used by Superior and Non-Superior Teachers. *The Social Studies*, 53(5): 171-174.

Maine Assessment of Educational Progress, Report 2. Results Report 1: Citizenship and Writing, 1972. 1972. Augusta, ME: Maine State Department of Educational and Cultural Services, Research Consortium for Educational Assessment. ED 080 598.

Malament, Elizabeth E. 1968. The Orientation of Beginning Social Studies Teachers in New York City Senior High Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, NY. (DA 29/02-A: 500-501)

Man and Environment for Secondary Schools: A Curriculum in Environmental Studies for High Schools. 1972. Miami, FL: National Association of Environmental Education. ED 086 473.

Mannello, G. 1970. Resource Unit Versus Instructional System. Unpublished paper, Hofstra University, School of Education. Cited in Tucker 1972.

Manolakes, G. 1958. Concept Development in Social Studies Textbooks. *National Elementary Principal*, 37: 25-27.

Marcus, Lloyd. 1961. *The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary School Textbooks*. New York, NY: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Marsh, Colin J. 1974. Evaluating Inquiry Teaching in Social Studies: A Model of Experimentation for Teacher Educators. Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, 27(2): 36-42.

Martorella, Peter H. 1977. Research on Social Studies Learning and Instruction: Cognition. In Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975, Francis P. Hunkins et al., pp. 15-53. Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC; and Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. SO 009 758.

Martorella, Peter H. 1973. Selected Early Childhood Affective Social Studies Programs: An Analysis of Theories, Structure, and Consistency. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly, San Francisco, CA. ED 103 333.

Masia, Bertram A. Fall 1963. Profile of the Current Secondary Social Studies Curriculum in North Central Association Schools. NCA Quarterly, 27: 205-213.

Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program: Citizenship and Social Studies, 1975-1976. 1976. Boston, MA: State Department of Education, Bureau of Research and Assessment. SO 009 908.

Massialas, Byron G. 1969. Citizenship and Political Socialization. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed., Robert L. Ebel, ed., pp. 124-141. New York, NY: Macmillan and American Educational Research Association.

Massialas, Byron G. 1967. American Government: We Are the Greatest! In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chapter 9. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Massialas, Bryon G., and Frederick R. Smith, eds. 1965. New Challenges in the Social Studies: Implications of Research for Teaching. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McAulay, J.D. September 1965. Controversial Issues in the Social Studies. Education, 86(1): 27-30.

McCabe, Milo F. 1974. Economic Concepts: 10-12. Pierre, SD: Division of Elementary and Secondary Education. ED 113 275.

McCutchen, Samuel P. February 1963. A Discipline for the Social Studies. Social Education, 27(2): 61-65.

McLaurin, Melton. Fall 1971. Images of Negroes in Deep South Public School State History Texts. Phylon, 32(3): 237-246.

McLendon, Jonathon C. May 1957. Significant Trends in the Social Studies Curriculum: 1952-1955. Social Education 21: 213-216.

McLeod, Jennifer S., and Sandra T. Silverman. 1973. "You Won't Do." What Textbooks on U.S. Government Teach High School Girls. Pittsburgh, PA: KNOW, Inc. ED 091 255.

McMillan, Richard Cupp. 1970. Religious Content in Selected Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, Durham, NC.

McPherson, James. Winter 1967. The "Saga" of Slavery, Setting the Textbooks Straight, Changing Education.

McPhie, Walter E. 1964. Dissertations in Social Studies Education: A Comprehensive Guide. Research Bulletin No. 2. Washington,DC: National Council for the Social Studies. ED 080 426.

Melin, Lloyd Henry. 1964. The Nature and Extent of Reading Instruction in Science and Social Studies in the Intermediate Grades of Selected School Districts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL (DA 25/06: 3328)

Mensoian, Michael George, Jr. 1961. Comparative Study of Geography and Social Studies Textbooks to Determine the Relative Emphasis Placed upon the Geographic Point of View. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT. (DA 23/05: 1626-1627)

Metcalf, Lawrence E. 1963. Research on Teaching the Social Studies. In Handbook of Research on Teaching, N.L. Gage, ed., pp. 929-965. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association/Rand McNally. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Metcalf, Lawrence E., and William D. Rader. 1967. Economics: Progress in Its Teaching. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chapter 8. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Michaelis, John U., ed. 1962. Social Studies in Elementary Schools, 32nd Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Michelli, Nicholas Michael. 1972. Social Studies Teachers and Instructional Objectives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, NY. (DA 33/08-A: 4068)

Michigan Department of Education. 1968. A Report on the Treatment of Minorities in American History Textbooks. Lansing, MI: Department of Education, State of Michigan.

Michigan Department of Public Instruction. 1963. The Treatment of Minority Groups in Textbooks. Publication No. 529. Lansing, MI: Department of Public Instruction, State of Michigan.

Miller, James R. 1969. A Descriptive Survey of the Social Background and the Preparation of Secondary School Social Studies Teachers in Ohio: 1967-1968. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, OH. (DA 30/10-A: 4313-4314)

Miller, Loren. March 1965. The Negro in History Textbooks. CTA Journal.

Mitchell, J.A. 1971. The Lack of Adequate Representation of Cultural and Ethnic Groups in Eighth Grade Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

Monson, Jay Albert. 1968. An Analysis of Programs of Utah Universities and Colleges Preparing Elementary School Teachers for Teaching Social Studies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, Logan, UT. (DA 29/07-A: 2136-2137)

Moreland, W.D. December 1958. Academic Preparation of Social Studies Teachers. *Social Education*, 22: 384-386.

Morrissett, Irving. March 1977. CIN, Curriculum Information Network Sixth Report: Preferred Approaches to the Teaching of Social Studies. *Social Education*, 41(3): 206-209.

Morrissett, Irving. February 1975. CIN, Curriculum Information Network, Third Report: Ratings of 24 Social Studies Materials. *Social Education*, 39(2): 96-99.

Morrissett, Irving. April 1975. Fourth Curriculum Information Network Report: Controversies in the Classroom. *Social Education*, 39(4): 246-252.

Morrissett, Irving. November 1975. CIN, Curriculum Information Network, Fifth Report: Ratings of 21 Social Studies Materials. *Social Education*, 39(7): 510-513.

Morrissett, Irving. October 1974. Curriculum Information Network: Second Report--Innovation: Its Climate and Its Helpers. *Social Education*, 38(6): 555-559.

Morrissett, Irving. 1973. CIN, Curriculum Information Network, First Report: Evaluations of Curriculum Materials. *Social Education*, 37(7): 665-668.

Morrissett, Irving, ed. 1967. *Concepts and Structure in the New Social Science Curricula*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Morrissett, Irving, and W. Williams Stevens, Jr., eds. 1971. *Social Science in the Schools: A Search for Rationale*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Mudd, Sister Rita of the Sacred Heart, F.C,S,P. 1961. A Content Analysis: The Treatment of Intergroup Relations in Social Studies Curriculum Materials Used in Catholic Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO.

Muessig, Raymond H., ed. 1975. *Controversial Issues in the Social Studies: A Contemporary Perspective*. 45th Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. ED 106 214.

Munday, Leo A. 1976. *Declining Admissions Test Scores*. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program. ED 120 245.

Murra, Wilbur F., Edgar B. Wesley, and Norah E. Zink. 1941. Social Studies. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1st ed., Walter S. Monroe, ed., pp. 1130-1156. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Myers, Robert J. March 1956. The Treatment of Social Security in Civics Textbooks. Social Education, 20(3): 111-114.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. Citizenship: National Results. Report 2. 1970. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. ED 049 113.

National Assessment of Educational Progress: Citizenship Objectives. 1970. Ann Arbor, MI: Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education, National Assessment of Educational Progress. ED 049 113.

National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement on the Freedom To Teach and the Freedom To Learn. April 1975. Social Education, 39(4): 240.

National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities. April 1975. Social Education, 39(4): 241-245.

National Survey: Social Studies Education Kindergarten--Grade 12. 1976. Richmond, VA: Division of Secondary Education, Virginia Department of Education.

Navajo Area Curriculum Development Project, Grades 5-8. 1970. Window Rock, AZ: Bureau of Indian Affairs. ED 047 844.

New In-Depth Evaluations of Social Studies Curricular Projects, Programs, and Materials. November 1972. Social Education, 36(7): entire issue.

Newmann, Fred M. November 1967. Questioning the Place of Social Science Disciplines in Education. Social Education, 31(7): 593-596.

Newton, Richard. October 1973. Induction in the New Social Studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 1(1): 27-57.

Noah, Harold J., Carl E. Prince, and C. Rusell Riggs. 1962. History in High School Textbooks: A Note. School Review, 70: 415-436.

Norris, Eleanor L., et al. 1972. National Assessment of Educational Progress. Citizenship: Group Results B. Preliminary Report 9. 1969-70 Assessment. Parental Education, Color, Size and Type of Community. Denver, CO: Education commission of the States. ED 068 407.

Northup, Terry. 1974. The "New Social Studies" Is Plural. Publication No. 6. Greensboro, NC: North Carolina University, Humanistic Education Project. ED 113 245.

O'Donnell, R.W. 1973. Sex Bias in Primary Social Studies Textbooks. Educational Leadership, 31: 137-141.

O'Neill, James B. 1973. Economics in Social Studies Textbooks: An Evaluation of the Economics and the Teaching Strategies in 11th and 12 th Grade U.S. and World History Textbooks. New York, NY: Joint Council on Economic Education.

Oswald, James M. 1972. Research in Social Studies and Social Science Education: Introduction, Analyses, and Reviews of Research. Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium. ED 083 058.

Palmer, John R. 1967. American History: Potential for Inquiry but Little Fulfillment. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds., Chapter 7. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Palmer, John R. 1965. Selection and Use of Textbooks and Audio-visual Materials. In New Challenges in the Social Studies: Implications of Research for Teaching, Bryon G. Massialas and Frederick R. Smith, eds., Chapter 6. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Palmer, John R. March 1961. History Textbooks and Social Change. Social Education, 25: 135-136.

Palmer, John Robert. 1960. The Treatment of Social Change in High School History Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana,IL.

Patrick, John J. 1969. Implications of Political Socialization Research for the Reform of Civic Education. Social Education, 33(1): 15021.

Patterns of Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools 1970-1971. 1972. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics. ED 096 774.

Payette, Roland F., C. Benjamin Cox, and William D. Johnson. 1970. Review of Research in Social Studies: 1969. Social Education, 34(8): 933-954. Reprinted in Oswald 1972, ED 083 058.

Pearson, Robert. December 1973. Beyond the New Social Studies. The Social Studies, 64(7): 315-319.

Peck, Robert F., and James A. Tucker. 1973. Research on Teacher Education. Seeond Handbook of Research on Teaching, R.M.W. Travers, ed., pp. 940-978. Chicago,IL: Rand McNally/American Educational Research Association.

Peiser, Andrew C. April 1973. Populism in High School Textbooks. Social Education, 37(4): 302-309, 316.

Penix, Findlay C. 1965. Teaching Social Studies in Elementary Schools. In New Challenges in the Social Studies: Implications of Research for Teaching, Byron G. Massialas and Frederick R. Smith, eds., Chapter 3. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Perrone, Vito. 1965. Image of Latin America: A Study of American School Textbooks and School Children, Grades 2-12, Cooperative Research Project #5-070. Marquette, MI: Northern Michigan University.

Ploghoft, Milton E. December 1965. Social Studies: Curriculum's Foggy Bottom. Social Education, 29(8): 539-540, 554.

Poetker, Joel Smith. 1971. The Curricular Appropriateness of the Social Studies Test Items Included in College Admission Examinations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. (DA 32/07-A: 3568-3569)

Pohlmann, V.V., anf F.L. Wellman. November 1960. Are High School Social Studies Teachers Adequately Prepared? Social Education, 24: 310-312.

Portzline, Donnell B. November 1966. A Critique of NDEA, Title XI: Institutes in Geography and History. Social Education, 30(7): 550-552.

Price, Robert D., and Thelma Spencer. April 1970. Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Their Relevance to the Negro Child. The Social Studies, 51(4): 168-173.

Price, Roy A., ed. 1963. Needed Research in the Teaching of the Social Studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Problems of Democracy for Secondary Schools, Learning Materials and Activities: Electives, Alternatives, Mini-Courses. 1971. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Curriculum Development, ED 085 274.

Procasky, William John. 1974. Contemporary Preparation of Teachers of Geography for Secondary Schools in Pennsylvania. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. (DA 35/04-A: 2015)

The Program of Social Studies Instruction Grades K-12. 1969. Detroit, MI: Board of Education, Detroit Public Schools. ED 049 083.

Program Improvement for Social Studies Education in Wisconsin. N.D. (1975-77?). Madison, WI: State Social Studies Curriculum Study Committee, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. SO 009 889.

Proposed Social Sciences Education Framework for California Public Schools: An Abstract from Revised Draft. 1970. Sacramento, CA: California State Board of Education. ED 049 114.

Psencik, Leroy F. December 1970. The Role of the State Social Studies Specialist. Social Education, 34(8): 909-961.

The Psychology Teacher's Resource Book: First Course. 1973. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rader, William D. 1967. The Intermediate Grades: Should Children Answer Their Own Questions? In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C.Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, eds. Chapter 3. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Ratcliffe, Robert Henry. 1966. A Critical Analysis of the Treatments Given Representative Social Science Ideas in Leading Eleventh Grade American History Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL (DA 27/07: 2014-A)

Raths, L.E., M. Harmin, and S.B. Simon. 1966. *Values and Teaching*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

A Rationale for Elementary Social Studies Programs: Area of Instructional Services. 1971. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education. ED 061 117.

Reactions to the Reports on Project Social Studies. October 1965. *Social Education*, 29(6): 356-360.

Reddington, Orville A. 1974. *Social Studies Program for Idaho Public Schools, Grades K-12*, rev. ed. Boise, ID: Idaho State Department of Education. ED 092 441.

Remy, Richard C. October 1972. High School Seniors' Attitudes Toward Their Civics and Government Instruction. *Social Education*, 36(6): 590-597.

Report on a National Study of the Nature and Quality of Instructional Materials Most Used by Teachers and Learners. 1977. EPIE Report No. 76. New York, NY: EPIE (Educational Products Information Exchange) Institute.

Resolution Passed by National Council for the Social Studies, November 29, 1957. February 1958. *Social Education*, 22(2): 53.

A Resource Project in Social Studies: Citizenship and the Law. 1967. Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Department of Education.

Reynolds, Billy Gene. 1969. Social Studies Practices in Selected Secondary Schools in East Tennessee. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN: (DA 30/11-A: 4879)

Rice, Marion J. 1976. Variables in Mastery Learning: Is a Mastery Learning Model Appropriate to the Social Studies? Paper presented at the 1976 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. ED 124 463.

Rich, Marion J. 1974. Treatment, Time, and Achievement: Do Searching Modes of Study Facilitate Learning? Paper presented at the 1974 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. ED 093 788.

Risinger, C. Frederick. March 1973. "New Social Studies" and the New School Environment: Are They Compatible? *The Social Studies*, 64(4) 114-117.

Riviere, Jo Ann C. 1973. *Introduction to Sociology: Social Studies*. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools. ED 086 611.

Robbins, John. February 1961. The New Asia and American Education. Teachers College Record, 62(5): 339-347.

Roberts, Louney F., Jr. December 1967. Ethnogenic Identification: A Survey of the Pictorial Content of Selected Current Elementary School Textbooks. Negro History Bulletin.

Robeson, Ronald Lee. 1974. The Diffusion of Educational Innovations Through the Explicit In-Service Training of Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Robinson, Donald W. November 1963. Ferment in the Social Studies. Social Education, 27(7): 360-364, 410.

Roeder, Harold H. January 1974. Almost Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Teacher Education. Phi Delta Kappan, 55(5): 349.

Rogers, V.R., and R.M. Zimmerman. April 1969. Analysis of the Treatment of Famous Individuals in Six Elementary School Social Studies Textbook Series. Negro Education Review, 20: 73-79.

The Role of the Social Studies. October 1962. Social Education, 26(6): 315-318, 327.

Root, E. Merrill. 1958. Brainwashing in the High Schools. New York, NY: Devin-Adair.

Rosenshine, Barak. 1972. Experimental Classroom Studies of Teacher Training, Teaching Behavior, and Student Achievement. In Research in Social Studies and Social Science Education, James M. Oswald, comp., App. B. Boulder, CO: SSEC and ERIC/ChESS. ED 083 058.

Sady, Rachel Reese. 1963? The Culture Concept and Ethnocentrism in World History Texts. Chicago, IL: Anthropology Curriculum Study Project. (Unpublished paper--copy available in archives of Resource and Demonstration Center, Social Science Education Consortium, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO.)

Rotzel, Alice W., and A. Bonnie Tenenbaum. 1974. Information Processing Theory in Attitude Change Applied to Social Studies Textbook Materials. Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. ED 103 285.

Sanders, Norris M., and Marlin L. Tanck. April 1970. A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects. Social Education, 34(4): 383-449.

Sandoval, Alberto. 1972. Treatment of Contemporary Mexican Americans in Selected Fifth Grade Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.

Saunders, Margaret Cathering. 1968. Contemporary Practices in Elementary School Social Studies Programs in Nebraska Schools Employing Curriculum Directors or Supervisors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE. (DA 29/12-A: 4251-5252)

Saveland, Robert N., and Clifton W. Pannell. 1975. *Inventory of Recent U.S. Research in Geographic Education*. Athens, GA: Geography Curriculum Project, University of Georgia.

Scardina, Florence. 1972. *Sexism in Textbooks in Pittsburgh Public Schools, Grades K-5*. Pittsburgh, PA. KNOW, Inc. ED 096 224.

Schisler, Bryan Lawrence. 1971. An Analysis and Evaluation of Affective Objectives in Recent Social Studies Curriculum Projects for the Junior High School. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Schreiber, Jan Emelia. 1967. Teachers' Question-asking Techniques in Social Studies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA: (DA 28/02-A: 523)

Searles, J.E. December 1965. Teacher of the Teacher of the Social Studies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 16: 445-449.

Secondary School Social Studies: Analyses of 31 Textbook Programs. 1976. EPIE Report No. 71. New York, NY: EPIE Institute.

Seifert, Thomas E. Spring 1971. A Comparison of Requirements at Thirty Institutions Preparing Secondary Social Studies Teachers. *Indiana Social Studies Quarterly*, 24(1): 43-45.

Selakovich, Daniel. December 1975. Has the New Social Studies Failed? *High School Journal*, 59(3): 130-136.

Sentell, Jane Elizabeth Jones. 1974. Latin America in Elementary Social Studies Textbooks: A Content Analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Shaver, James P. April 1977. A Critical View of the Social Studies Profession. *Social Education*, 41(4): 300-307.

Shaver, James P. November 1967. Social Studies: The Need for Redefinition. *Social Education*, 31(7): 588-592, 596.

Shaver, James P. Autumn 1965. Reflective Thinking, Values, and Social Studies Textbooks. *School Review*, 73(3): 226-257.

Shaver, James P. 1962. Educational Research and Instruction for Critical Thinking. *Social Education*, 26(1): 13-16.

Shaver, James P., and A. Guy Larkins. 1973. Research on Teaching Social Studies. In *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Robert M.W. Travers, ed., pp. 1243-1262. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association/Rand McNally.

Shive, Rossie Jerrald. 1969. Three Curriculum Projects and Value Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.

Siemers, Allan A. November 1960. A National Social Studies Curriculum? Social Education, 27(7): 305-306.

Siemers, Allan A. April 1960. World History: Practices and Problems. Social Education, 27(4): 153-157.

Simms, R.L. 1975. Bias in Textbooks: Noy Yet Corrected. Phi Delta Kappan, 57: 201-202.

Skretting, J.R., and J.E. Sundeen. 1969. Social Studies Education. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed., Robert L. Ebel, ed, pp. 1231-1241. New York, NY: American Educational Research Association/ Macmillan. Reprinted in Oswald 1972. ED 083 058.

Sloan, Fred A., Jr. 1959. Readability of Social Studies Textbooks for Grades Four, Five, and Six, as Measured by the Dale-Chall Formula. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, TN.

Sloan, Irving. 1974. The American Labor Movement in Modern History and Government Textbooks. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers. ED 088 789.

Sloan, Irving, 1967. The Negro in Modern American History Textbooks, 2d ed. Chicago, IL: American Federation of Teachers.

Slotkin, Aaron N. May 1964. The Treatment of Minorities in Textbooks: The Issues and the Outlook. Strengthening Democracy. New York, NY: New York City Board of Education.

Smith, Frederick R., and John J. Patrick. 1967. Civics: Relating Social Study to Social Reality. In Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas, es., Chapter 6. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Smith, Gerald R. November 1963. Project Social Studies--A Report. Social Education, 27(7): 357-359.

Smith, Ronald Oliver. 1966. An Evaluation of Secondary School Social Studies Textbooks in Problems Courses, Civics, and Government as Their Treatment of the Model of Inquiry Used for the Advancement of Knowledge in the Discipline of Political Science. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR: (DA 28/03:1013)

Social Education, February 1964, 28(2): special issue on teaching about Communism.

Social Education, April 1958, 22(4). Special issue on the USSR and Communism.

Social Science Education Consortium. 197--. Social Studies Curriculum Materials Data Book, 3 vols. Boulder, CO: SSEC. ED 051 059.

Social Science Guide, K-12. 1967. Colorado Springs, CO: School District No. 11.

Social Sciences Education Framework for California Public Schools. 1975. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education. ED 120 079.

Social Sciences Education Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten and Grades One Through Twelve. 1968. Sacramento, CA: Statewide Social Sciences Study Committee, State Department of Education. ED 035 066.

Social Studies: 1970: Instructional Objectives for Grades 1-8. 1970. Chicago, IL: Catholic School Board. ED 046 854.

Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines: National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement. 1971. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. (Also in *Social Education*, December 1971, 35(8): 853-869)

The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary Schools of Virginia. 1976. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Department of Education.

Social Studies for Young Adolescents: Programs for 7, 8, and 9. 1967. Curriculum Series No. 6. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Social Studies, Grade 3. State Assessment of Educational Progress in North Carolina, 1973-1974. 1975. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Research. ED 108 988.

Social Studies Guide: Kindergarten--Level Twelve. 1970. Hazelwood, MO: Hazelwood School District. ED 051 159.

Social Studies in Oregon Secondary Schools. 1955. Salem, OR: Oregon State Board of Education.

Social Studies in the Senior High School. 1965. Curriculum Series No. 7. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Social Studies K-12, Program of Studies. 1974. Fairfax, VA: Fairfax County Schools. ED 110 364.

Social Studies Objectives: Second Assessment. 1974. Denver, CO: National Assessment of Educational Progress. ED 097 288.

Social Studies Program for Idaho Public Schools, Grades K-12, rev. ed. 1974. Boise, ID: Idaho State Department of Education. ED 092 441.

Social Studies: The Elementary School Curriculum, Grades K-6. 1961. Albany, NY: State Education Department.

Social Studies Today: Guidelines for Curriculum Improvement. 1971. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Social Studies Today: Guidelines for Curriculum Improvement. 1970. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, Bureau of General and Academic Education. ED 051 051.

Splittgerber, Fredric Lee. 1966. An Analysis of Social Studies Grouping Practices in Selected Senior High Schools of Eight Midwestern States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, Lincoln, NE. (DA 27/10-A: 3238)

Spurgin, John H., and Gary R. Smith. 1973. *Global Dimensions in the New Social Studies*. Denver, CO: Center for Teaching International Relations, and Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC,and Washington, DC: Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association. ED 085 291.

Stampp, Kenneth, et al. October-November 1964. The Negro in American History Textbooks. *Integrated Education*, 2: 9-25.

Standards for Social Studies Teachers: Position Statement of the National Council for the Social Studies. December 1971. *Social Education*, 35(8): 845-852.

State Educational Assessment Programs. 1973 Revision. Princeton, NJ: Education Testing Service; and Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. ED 080 582.

State Testing Programs: 1973 Revision. Princeton, NJ: ERIC Clearinghouse of Texts, Measurement, and Evaluation. 1973. ED 087 789.

Statement of Teaching Preparation, Teacher Load and Assignment. April 1965. *Social Education*, 29(4): 205.

Stoval, Thomas F. 1958. Lecture Vs. Discussion. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 39: 255-258.

Sublett, Collier Matlock, Jr. 1972. Twentieth-Century Treatments of the City in Eleventh-Grade American Histories, 1900-1970. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Superka, Douglas P., Christine Ahrens, and Judith E. Hedstrom. 1976. *Values Education Sourcebook: Conceptual Approaches, Materials Analyses, and an Annotated Bibliography*. Boulder, CO: SSEC and ERIC/Chess. ED 118 465.

Survey-Elective Social Studies Program for Senior High Schools. 1971. Anchorage, AK: Anchorage Borough School District. ED 066 408.

Survey of Social Studies Teaching. October 31, 1964. *School and Society*, 92: 302+.

Switzer, Thomas J., Malcolm A. Lowther, William M. Hanna, and Rolph D. Kidder. 1977. Dissemination and Implementation of Social Studies Project Materials. In *Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials*, C.L. Hahn et al., Chapter 3. Boulder, CO: SSEC. SO 009 772.

Tamashiro, Masamitsu. 1972. An Analysis of the Treatment of Selected Aspects of United States-Japan Relations from 1905 to 1960 as Found in High School History Textbooks of Both Nations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, NY.

Tarter, Martin Alexander, Jr. 1969. An Analysis of United States History Textbooks as Instruments for Developing Basic Economic Understanding. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA. (DA 30/10: 4342-A)

Taylor, Bob L. February 1966. Articulated Social Studies Curriculum. Education, 56: 334-339.

Taylor, Bob L., and Thomas L. Groom. 1971. Social Studies Education Projects: An A.S.C.D. Index. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Templeton, R.K., and M.L. Hawkins. 1972. Ten Years of Inquiry: A Selective Review of Research. Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, 25(2): 68-74.

Textbook Committee on the Committee on Economic Education of the American Economic Association. 1963. Economics in the Schools. American Economic Review, 53(1, pt. 2 supp.): 1-27.

Thompson, Charles A., Jr. 1973. Secondary Social Studies Methods Instruction in the United States and Its Relationship to the New Social Studies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. (DA 34/12-A: 7632)

Thompson, Loren J. 1970. The Usefulness of the Schwab Model to Identify a Structure of Knowledge in Selected American History Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus,OH.

Townshend-Zellner, Norman. Fall 1970. A New Look at the High School Economics Texts. Journal of Economic Education, 2(1); 63-68.

Traverso, Edmund. 1969. Education in the Age of Aquarius. Chicago, IL: Newberry Library, Illinois Committee on the Study of History. ED 041 788.

Trecker, Janice L. 1971. Women in U.S. History Textbooks. Social Education, 35: 249-260, 338.

Tresize, R. 1974. 1974 Michigan Social Studies Textbook Study. Lansing, MI: Michigan State Department of Education. ED 091 273.

Tucker, Jan L. 1977. Research on Social Studies Teaching and Teacher Education. In Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975, Francis P. Hunkins et al., pp. 97-135. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies; and Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC. SP 009 758.

Tucker, Jan L. May 1972. Teacher Educators and the "New" Social Studies. Social Education, 36(5): 548-554, 560.

Tullock, Gordon, and Robert Johnson. Autumn 1966. Economics. *The University Bookman*, 7: 15-23.

Turetsky, Fred. 1974. The Treatment of Black Americans in Primary Grade Textbooks Used In New York City Elementary Schools. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 2(1): 25-49.

Turner, Mary Jane. 1971. *Materials for Civics, Government, and Problems of Democracy: Political Science in the New Social Studies*. Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS and SSEC. ED 048 071.

Turner, Mary Jane, and Frances Haley. 1977. Utilization of "New Social Studies" Curriculum Programs. In *Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials*, C.L. Hahn et al., Chapter 4. Boulder, CO: SSEC. SO 009 772.

Uphoff, James Kent. 1967. Senior High School Social Studies Programs for Low Achievers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, Lincoln, NE. (DA 28/06-A: 2002)

Urick, Ronald V. 1965. The Reflective Approach to Social Studies Education and Historical Explanations in American History Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Vogel, Virgil J. May-June 1968. The Indian in American History Textbooks. *Integrated Education*, 33: 16-32.

Wade, Bernice Stiles. 1965. A Study of Recent Changes in the Social Studies Program of the Public Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC. (DA 26/09: 1439)

Wadleigh, Clarence Benjamin. Jr. 1969. Questions in American History Textbooks as Contributors to Development of Thinking Skills. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Walker, Robert Edwin. 1974. Factors Affecting the Implementation of National Project Materials in Social Studies Programs in Secondary Schools in Nebraska. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE.

Watson, George G., Jr., Hossein Askari, Philip E. Campbell, May E. Milliken, and Daniel Ounjian. 1973. *Economics in Social Studies Textbooks: An Evaluation of the Economics and The Teaching Strategies in Social Studies Textbooks, Junior High School (Grades 7-9)*. New York, NY: Joint Council on Economic Education.

Watt, Lois B., and Myra H. Thomas. 1971. *Environmental Ecological Education: A Bibliography of Fiction, Nonfiction and Textbooks for Elementary and Secondary Schools*. Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium. ED 055 937.

Weidenaar, Dennis J., Peter V. Harrington, Robert V. Horton, and S. Samuel Shermis. 1973. *Economics in Social Studies Textbooks: An Evaluation of the Economics and the Teaching Strategies in Social Studies Textbooks, High School (Grades 10-12)*. New York, NY: Joint Council on Economic Education.

Weidner, Daniel Warren Frederick. 1972. A Study of American History Teachers' Use of National Social Studies Programs in Public Secondary Schools of Alabama. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, University, AL.

Weintraub, Richard. 1970. A Review of the Research on Pre-Service Social Studies Secondary Teacher Education. Los Angeles, CA: Constitutional Rights Foundation. ED 051 006.

Weisenberg, L.A. April 1968. A Critique of the New Social Studies. The Social Studies, 59(4): 166-169.

Weitzman, Lenore J., and Diane Rizzo. 1975. Sex Bias in Textbooks. Today's Education, 64: 49-52.

Wells, Tim Joe. 1973. Oklahoma Secondary Social Studies Teachers and the Usage of New National Social Studies Projects. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.

Wendt, Shirley Caroline. 1963. A Survey of the Educational Backgrounds and the Problems Met by a Selected Group of Elementary Teachers Teaching Social Studies in Homeroom in a Metropolitan Area. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI. (DA 25/10: 5702-5703)

Wentworth, Donald R., W. Lee Hansen, and Sharryl H. Hawke. 1977. Perspectives on Economic Education. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, Joint Council on Economic Education, and National Council for the Social Studies.

Wentworth, Donald R., and Darrell R. Lewis. 1973. A Review of Research on Instructional Games and Simulations in Social Studies Education. Social Education, 37(5): 532-440.

Wesley, Edgar B., and Stanley P. Wronski. 1958. Teaching Social Studies in High Schools. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath.

Wiley, Karen B. 1976. The NSF Science Education Controversy: Issues, Events, Decisions. Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium. ED 135 674.

Wiley, Karen B., and Douglas P. Superka. 1977. Evaluation Studies on "New Social Studies" Materials. Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium. SO 009 707.

Wilkinson, Rachel D. January 1964. Social Studies in the Elementary Schools. Education, 34(5): 280-285.

Wilson, Gilbert M. 1958. Quantitative Content in Elementary School Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, TN.

Windley, Vivian Odessa. 1967. Levels of Cognition and Social Science Content in Classroom Current Affairs Periodicals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, CA. (DA 28/03; 887-888-A)

Woellner, Elizabeth H. 1975-76. *Requirements for Certification: Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges*, 40th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Woellner, Elizabeth H., and M. Aurilla Wood. 1965-66. *Requirements for Certification: Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges*, 30th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Woellner, Robert C., and M. Aurilla Wood. 1955-56. *Requirements for Certification of Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges*, 20th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wong, Sheh. 1971. China in High School Social Studies Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Wood, Frederick Harrison. 1966. A Study of Social Studies Education in the Rural, Urban, and Suburban High Schools of Missouri. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO. (DA 27/11-A: 3787)

Wronski, Stanley P. May 1959. A Proposed Breakthrough for the Social Studies. *Social Education*, 23(5): 215-218.

Yee, Albert H. 1973. Myopic Perceptions and Textbooks: Chinese Americans' Search for Identity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 29(2): 99-113.

Yielding, Katrina. 1967. An Evaluation of Selected Secondary School Textbooks in United States History, Based on an Analysis of the Treatment Given the Topic: Government Involvement in the Economy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Zahnister, Kenneth Clair. 1955. The Readability of Economic Textbooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Zimmerman, Roger. April-July 1975. Social Studies Textbooks Still Neglect Racial Minorities and Women, and Short Change Children. *Negro Educational Review*, 26(2&3): 116-123.

Zimmerman, Roger Marvin. 1967. An Analysis of the Treatment of Famous Individuals in Six Elementary School Social Studies Textbook Series. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

APPENDIX TO

THE STATUS OF PRE-COLLEGE SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION: 1955-1975

VOLUME III: SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

Karen B. Wiley

with

Jeanne Race

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado

1977

Supported by Contract NSF-C7620627 from the National Science Foundation to the Center for Science and Mathematics Education, The Ohio State University; Stanley L. Helgeson, Project Director.

Table of Contents

Page

Terms Used in Computer Searches, by Regina McCormick 1

Tables 13

Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines 79

Recommendations of the American Economic Association's National Task Force on Economic Education, 1961 85

Conference Participant Recommendations for Precollege Economic Education, 1977 88

Goals and Status of Precollegiate Education in Political Science and Strategies for Improving It, 1971 96

Terms Used in Computer Searches

by

Regina McCormick

ERIC Search: Part I

TERMS AND SEARCH STRATEGY USED IN SEARCH OF ERIC DATA BASE

July-August 1976

SET DESCRIPTION	*STRATEGY USED
A. SOCIAL STUDIES SOCIAL SCIENCES ANTHROPOLOGY/DE ECONOMICS INSTRUCTION GEOGRAPHY/DE HUMAN GEOGRAPHY PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY WORLD GEOGRAPHY GEOGRAPHY INSTRUCTION HISTORY/DE HISTORY INSTRUCTION UNITED STATES HISTORY AMERICAN HISTORY WORLD HISTORY EUROPEAN HISTORY ASIAN HISTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE SOCIOLOGY/DE PSYCHOLOGY/DE	
B. ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ELEMENTARY GRADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS ELEMENTARY SECONDARY EDUCATION INTERMEDIATE GRADES MIDDLE SCHOOLS GRADE 1 GRADE 2 GRADE 3 GRADE 4 GRADE 5 GRADE 6	

---

* $ = Combine
* = And
+ = Or
- = Not
) = Limit By
MAJ = Major Descriptor

SET DESCRIPTION	STRATEGY USED
C. SECONDARY EDUCATION SECONDARY GRADES SECONDARY SCHOOLS SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS GRADE 7 GRADE 8 GRADE 9 GRADE 10 GRADE 11 GRADE 12	
D. TREND ANALYSIS EDUCATIONAL TRENDS ENROLLEMENT TRENDS TRENDS	$A*D*(B+C)
E. NATIONAL SURVEYS STATE SURVEYS SURVEYS SCHOOL SURVEYS STATISTICAL SURVEYS STATE OF THE ART REVIEWS	$A*E)MAJ *(B+C)
F. EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE EDUCATIONAL(w)PRACTICE EDUCATIONAL(w)PRACTICES EXISTING(w)PRACTICES PATTERN(w)ANALYSIS ANALYSIS(f)PATTERNS	$A*F*(B+C)
G. NEEDS ASSESSMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENTS NEEDS(w)ASSESSMENT NEEDS(w)ASSESSMENTS EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	$A*G*(B+C)
H. TEACHER EDUCATION INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PRESERVICE EDUCATION INSERVICE COURSES INSERVICE EDUCATION INSERVICE PROGRAMS INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS) SUMMER INSTITUTES STUDENT TEACHING	

SET DESCRIPTION	STRATEGY USED
I. COURSE DESCRIPTIONS PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS TIME TIME BLOCKS RESEARCH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH DOCTORAL THESES MASTERS THESES	$A*H)MAJ *I*(B+C)
J. TEACHER EVALUATION EFFECTIVE TEACHING TEACHER IMPROVEMENT TEACHER QUALITY TEACHER ATTITUDES	$A*J)MAJ *(B+C)
K. TEACHER CERTITICATION CERTIFICATION CERTIFICATION(w)REQUIREMENTS CERTIFICATION(w)REQUIREMENTS	$A*K*(B+C)
L. CURRICULUM GUIDES STATE CURRICULUM GUIDES	$L*(Social Studies or Social Sciences))MAJ *(B+C)
M. OBJECTIVES AFFECTIVE OBJECTIVES BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES COGNITIVE OBJECTIVES EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES	$A*M)MAJ *(B+C)
N. ENROLLMENT AVERAGE DAILY ENROLLMENT ENROLLMENT INFLUENCES ENROLLMENT RATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT	$A*N*(B+C)
O. COMPARATIVE EDUCATION	
P. COURSES	$P*A)MAJ
Q. ENROLLMENT	

SET DESCRIPTION	STRATEGY USED
R. COST(w)EFFECTIVENESS EXPENDITURES EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT	$A*(Social Studies *(B+C) or Social Sciences)
S. SURVEYS NATIONAL SURVEYS SCHOOL SURVEYS STATE SURVEYS	
T. EDUCATIONAL NEEDS EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE	$A*S*T*U not 0
U. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	
V. EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT STUDENT ATTITUDES ACHIEVEMENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STUDENT OPINION STUDENT EVALUATION ACHIEVEMENT RATING	$V*(Social Studies or Social sciences))MAJ *(B+C) not 0
W. COURSE DESCRIPTIONS PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS	$W*(Social Studies *(B+C) or not 0 Social Sciences)
X. TIME TIME BLOCKS SCHOOL SCHEDULES	$X*(Social Studies or Social Sciences))MAJ not 0
Y. TEACHING METHODS TEACHING TECHNIQUES TEACHING MODELS INSTRUCTION TEACHING PROCEDURES	$Y*(Social Studies or Social Sciences))MAJ *(B+C) not 0
Z. LABORATORIES LIBRARIES LIBRARY FACILITIES LIBRARY SERVICES FACILITIES EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES STUDY FACILITIES	$Z*(Social Studies or Social Sciences))MAJ

ERIC Search: Part II

TERMS AND SEARCH STRATEGY USED IN SEARCH OF ERIC DATA BASE

July-August 1976

SET DESCRIPTION	*STRATEGY USED
A. SOCIAL STUDIES SOCIAL SCIENCES	
B. ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ELEMENTARY GRADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS ELEMENTARY SECONDARY EDUCATION INTERMEDIATE GRADES MIDDLE SCHOOLS GRADE 1 GRADE 2 GRADE 3 GRADE 4 GRADE 5 GRADE 6	
C. SECONDARY EDUCATION SECONDARY GRADES SECONDARY SCHOOLS SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS GRADE 7 GRADE 8 GRADE 9 GRADE 10 GRADE 11 GRADE 12	
D. COMPARATIVE EDUCATION	

* $ = Combine
* = And
+ = Or
- = Not
) = Limit By
MAJ = Major

SET DESCRIPTION	STRATEGY USED
E. SPECIALISTS LEARNING SPECIALISTS MEDIA SPECIALISTS CONSULSTANTS MOBILE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES SHARED SERVICES PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTATION PROGRAMS INTERMEDIATE ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS REFERRAL INFORMATION SERVICES	$E*A*(B+C) not D
F. FULL STATE FUNDING SCHOOL DISTRICT SPENDING STATE AID EDUCATIONAL FINANCE BUDGETS BEDGETING FINANCIAL SUPPORT SCHOOL FUNDS STATE FEDERAL AID STUDENT COSTS SCHOOL TAXES SCHOOL DISTRICT SPENDING PROGRAM BUDGETING TRAINING ALLOWANCES RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS	$F*A*(B+C) not D
G. ADMINISTRATOR ROLE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT ROLE BOARD OF EDUCATION ROLE COMMUNITY ROLE FAMILY ROLE PARENT ROLE TEACHER ROLE STUDENT ROLE ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES COMMUNITY ATTITUDES COMMUNITY INFLUENCE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	$G*A)MAJ *(B+C) not D
H. TEXTBOOK SELECTION TEACHER SELECTION ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CURRICULUM PLANNING COURSE CONTENT	$H*A)MAJ *(B+C) not D

SET DESCRIPTION	STRATEGY USED
I. ACCREDITATION (INSTITUTIONS) STATE STANDARDS ACADEMIC STANDARDS ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS STATE LEGISLATION	$I*A*(B+C) not D
J. TEACHER(w)PERFORMANCE TEACHING(w)PERFORMANCE	$J*A*(B+C) not D
K. CAREER CHOICE CAREER PLANING SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND	$K*A*(B+C) not D
L. SLOW LEARNERS TALENTED STUDENTS GIFTED SUPERIOR STUDENTS LOW ABILITY STUDENTS EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED MENTALLY HANDICAPPED RETARDED CHILDREN RETARDED READERS ACADEMIC ABILITY STUDENT ABILITY STUDENT MOTIVATION STUDENT SELF IMAGE	$L*A)MAJ *(B+C) not D
M. ACHIEVEMENT TESTS NORM REFERENCED TESTS CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS STUDENT EVALUATION TEST RESULTS STUDENT TESTING TESTING PROGRAMS PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	$M*A)MAJ *(B+C) not D
N. TEACHER EMPLOYMENT CREDENTIALS TEACHER QUALITICATIONS TEACHING SKILLS PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EDUCATION EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS	$N*A*(B+C) not D

ERIC Search: Part III

TERMS AND SEARCH STRATEGY USED IN SEARCH OF DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

July-August 1976

SET DESCRIPTION	*STRATEGY USED
A. SOCIAL SCIENCES AMERICAN STUDIES ANTHROPOLOGY ECONOMICS HISTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE SOCIOLOGY SOCIAL SCIENCE SOCIAL STUDIES POLITICAL SCIENCE GEOGRAPHY	
B. ELEMENTARY MIDDLE SCHOOL PRESCHOOL SECONDARY PRE COLLEGIATE	$A*C*C
C. YEAR = 1973	

* $ = Combine
* = And
+ = Or
- = Not
) = Limit By
MAJ = Major Descriptor

ERIC Search: Part IV

TERMS AND SEARCH STRATEGY USED IN COMPUTER SEARCH OF SOCIOLOGICAL ABSTRACTS

July-August 1976

SET DESCRIPTION	*SEARCH STRATEGY
A. SOCIAL SCIENCES AMERICAN STUDIES ANTHROPOLOGY ECONOMICS HISTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE SOCIOLOGY SOCIAL SCIENCE SOCIAL STUDIES POLITICAL SCIENCE GEOGRAPHY	$A*B
B. ELEMENTARY MIDDLE SCHOOL PRESCHOOL SECONDARY PRE COLLEGIATE	

* $ = Combine
* = And

ERIC Search: Part V

TERMS AND SEARCH STRATEGY USED IN COMPUTER SEARCH OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ABSTRACTS

July-August 1976

SET DESCRIPTION	*SEARCH STRATEGY
A. SOCIAL SCIENCES SOCIAL STUDIES ANTHROPOLOGY SOCIOLGOY PSYCHOLOGY	
B. SECONDARY EDUCATION JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS HIGH SCHOOLS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL STUDENTS PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS PRIMARY SCHOOLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION PRIVATE SCHOOL EDUCATION	
C. CURRICULUM EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SCHOOL FACILITIES EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES LEARNING CENTERS (EDUCATIONAL) SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENT ATTITUDES TEACHER ATTITUDES TEACHER EDUCATION INSERVICE TEACHER EVALUATION VISUALLY HANDICAPPED	$C*A*B

* $ = Combine
* = And
+ = Or
- = Not
) = Limit By
MAJ = Major Descriptor

SET DESCRIPTION	SEARCH STRATEGY
D. ABILITY GROUPING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ACADEMIC APTITUDE ACCREDITATION (EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL) CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION DROPOUTS EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND EDUCATIONAL INCENTIVES EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS PERSONNEL TRAINING SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT SCHOOL LEARNING SCHOOL READINESS SCHOOLS STUDY HABITS TEACHER PERSONALITY TEACHER STUDENT INTERACTION TEACHER TENURE TEACHING THEORIES OF EDUCATION	$D*A*B (Not set resulting from [$C*A*B] to get rid of duplicates)

Tables

Page

Table A-1: Social Studies Knowledge Objectives: 1955-1975 14

Table A-2: Social Studies Attitude Objectives: 1955-1975 17

Table A-3: Social Studies Skill Objectives: 1955-1975 21

Table A-4: Scope of the Social Studies: 1955-1975 24

Table A-5: Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts 33

Table A-6: Social Studies/Social Science Requirements for Elementary Teaching Certificate 53

Table A-7: Social Studies/Social Science Requirements for Secondary Teaching Certificate in Social Studies . . 57

Notes to Tables A-6 and A-7 65

Table A-8: Complete Listing of NAEP Knowledge Area Exercises 67

Table A-9: State Student Testing Programs in Social Science/Social Studies and Citizenship, 1973 73

Table A-10: Reports of State Student Testing Programs in Social Science/Social Studies and Citizenship Available Through ERIC as of Spring 1977 75

Table A-11: Summary of Student Social Studies Achievement and Teacher Ratings on Social Studies Assessment Objectives 76

Table A-1

Social Studies Knowledge Objectives: 1955-1975

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
1. Interdependence	1. Students will be able to understand the dependence and interdependence of man.	1.	1. Students will be able to understand the interdependence of people and the interrelationships existing among nations of the world.	1. Teachers will create in their students an understanding of the interdependence of men and nations, and through such understanding develop the broader social-mindedness essential to human progress and well-being.	1. Students will realize the inevitability of change as it affects societal adjustment in the role of interdependence among individuals, societies, and nations.
2. Other Cultures	2. Students will understand that all peoples and cultures have contributed to the world; that none are superior or inferior; and that all societies have some things in common.	2. Students will be aware of the contributions of other cultures.	2.	2. Students will understand the relationships of all peoples through the study of geographical, social, economic, and political divisions.	2. Students will develop knowledge of other cultures.
3. American Heritage	3. Students will know about the great people in America's past; their thoughts and deeds	3. Students will understand their American heritage through the study of community and national backgrounds.	3.	3. Students will become acquainted with the significant elements of our social, moral, spiritual, cultural, political, and economic heritage.	3. Students will develop knowledge of their own cultural heritage.
4. Good Citizenship	4. Students will know the obligations of good citizenship and the democratic way of life as opposed to competing ideologies.	4. Students will be aware of what constitutes good citizenship.	4. Students will understand the democratic life and its advantages compared to competing ideologies.	4.	4. Students will be aware of what constitutes good citizenship.

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
5. Economics	5. Students will understand the principles of the American economic system and the evils of statism and collectivism.	5. Students will know the principles and factors of the American economic system.	5. Students will know the principles of the American economic system.	5. Students will acquire a practical and theoretical understanding of economic concepts which makes possible an adaptation to change.	5. Students will be knowledgable about economic factors.
6. Human History	6.	6. Students will have a knowledge of human society--past and present.	6. Students will understand the relationship of past and present.	6. Students will develop a knowledge of man's existence on earth and the issues resulting.	6.
7. World Affairs	7. Students will understand the relationship of the U.S. to the rest of the world.	7. Students will study and understand conflicting forces.	7.	7.	7. Students will be aware of world problems.
8. Geography	8.	8.	8. Students will understand the effects of various geographic factors.	8. Students will acquire functional information about man's physical environment and his varied political, social, and economic institutions that serve to carry out human needs and desires.	8.
9. Technology	9.	9.	9. Students will be aware of the changes wrought by technology.	9.	9.
10. Natural Resources	10.	10.	10. Students will be aware of the importance of natural resources and how best to conserve them.	10.	10. Students will have knowledge of sound conservation practices.

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
11. Individual--Nation Relationship	11.	11.	11. Students will be aware of the relationship of the individual to his country in a democracy.	11.	11.
12. Family	12.	12.	12.	12.	12. Students will be aware of the various factors that affect family life.
13. Race and Religion	13.	13.	13.	13.	13. Students will be aware of the various races and creeds found throughout their country and the world.
14. Social Science	14.	14.	14.	14.	14. Students will be able to develop understandings based on data and concepts drawn from the various social science disciplines.

Sources Used for the Knowledge Objectives Chart

Contact, 1975; Curriculum Guide Grades 4-7, 1968; The Elementary School Curriculum, 1955; Fort Benton Social Studies Curriculum Outline, 1970; A Guide for Instruction in the Social Studies, 1955; The Program of Social Studies Instruction Grades K-12, 1969; Social Studies Education Framework for California Public Schools, 1975; Social Science Guide, K-12, 1967; Social Studies, 1961; Social Studies Guide, 1970; Social Studies in Oregon Secondary Schools, 1955; Social Studies Program for Idaho Public Schools, Grades K-12, 1974; Social Studies in the Senior High School, 1965; Social Studies for Young Adolescents, 1967; A Study of Recent Changes in the Social Studies Program of the Public Schools, 1964.

Table A-2

Social Studies Attitude Objectives: 1955-1975

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
1. Patriotism	1. Students will have a sense of loyalty and patriotism to their country.	1. Students will have a sense of loyalty and patriotism to their country and accordingly be good democratic citizens.	1. Students will have a sense of loyalty and patriotism to their country and accordingly be good citizens.	1. Students will have a sense of loyalty to their country.	1. Students will appreciate the American form of government and be good citizens.
2. Respect for Laws and Authority	2. Students will exhibit respect for the law and legally constituted authority.	2.	2.	2. Students will have respect for legally constituted authority.	2. Students will respect the laws and accept authority.
3. Honesty	3. Students will be honest and respect honesty in others.	3.	3.	3.	3.
4. Responsibility	4. Students will accept responsibility.	4. Students will strive to develop social responsibility.	4. Students will live responsibly.	4. Students will exhibit responsibility.	4.
5. Moral Values	5. Students will have spiritual strength.	5. Students will work on developing an ethical and moral character.	5. Students will develop spiritual and moral values.	5. Students will develop a good character.	5.
6. Respect for Elders	6. Students should respect their elders.	6.	6.	6.	6.
7. Tolerance	7. Students will be against discrimination and prejudice.	7.	7. Students will show respect for people of different cultural, economic, and religious backgrounds.	7. Students will develop tolerance and not be prejudice.	7.
8. Art Appreciation	8. Students will appreciate the arts.	8.	8. Students will exhibit an appreciation of the arts.	8.	8.

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
9. Regard for Others	9. Students will show sympathy for the problems of others and intelligent direction of individual personal problems.	9.	9. Students will show respect for the feelings and rights of others.	9. Students will exhibit social sensitivity and respect for the rights of others.	9. Students will have regard for the feelings of others.
10. Respect for Property	10. Students will have respect for property.	10.	10. Students will have respect for the property of others.	10.	10.
11. Appreciation of Work	11. Students will appreciate the dignity of work.	11.	11. Students will have an appreciation of work.	11.	11. Students will exhibit a respect for work and general career awareness.
12. Individual Dignity	12.	12. Students will show an awareness of the worth and dignity of every individual.	12.	12. Students will show an awareness of the worth and dignity of every individual.	12. Students will show an awareness of the dignity of humans and all other living things.
13. Appreciation of Other Cultures	13.	13. Students will show an appreciation for other cultures.	13.	13. Students will show an appreciation for other cultures.	13. Students will appreciate and relate to other cultures.
14. Respect for Differences	14.	14.	14. Students will show a respect for individual and group differences.	14.	14. Students will show a respect for individual and group differences.
15. Participation	15.	15.	15. Students will exhibit active democratic participation.	15. Students will be concerned about involvement.	15. Students will be concerned and involved.
16. Self	16.	16.	16. Students will exhibit self-respect and self-discipline.	16.	16. Students will develop a positive self-identity, a self-actualization and be productive.

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
17. Personal Satisfaction	17.	17.	17. Students will derive satisfaction from personal achievement and group acceptance.	17.	17.
18. Respect for Democratic Process	18.	18.	18. Students will show respect for the process of democratic decision-making and for the differences of opinion of others.	18. Students will appreciate the decision-making process and show respect for the opinions of others.	18. Students will show respect for the opinions and values of others.
19. Appreciation of Natural Resources	19.	19.	19.	19. Students will appreciate and be responsible for our natural resources.	19.
20. Awareness of Beliefs	20.	20.	20.	20. Students will be aware of and appreciate the bases of their ideas, beliefs, and attitudes.	20. Students will recognize the origins of their beliefs.
21. Acceptance of Change	21.	21.	21.	21. Students will be able to accept change.	21. Students will accept change and work for it in a constructive manner.
22. Preference for Rationality	22.	22.	22.	22.	22. Students will want to learn and to think rationally.
23. Appreciation of Leisure	23.	23.	23.	23.	23. Students will appreciate leisure time and be aware of ways to use it wisely.

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
24. Belief-Behavior Relationships	24.	24.	24.	24.	24. Students will recognize the relationships between their beliefs and their behaviors.
25. Value Clarification	25.	25.	25.	25.	25. Students will be able to clarify their value system in relationship to the value system in which they live.

Sources Used for Attitude Objectives Chart

Contact, 1975; *Curriculum Guide Grades 4-7*, 1968; *Curriculum Guide to Social Studies, Grades 4-6*, 1969; *East-Syracuse-Minoa Schools Environmental Education Materials*, 1973; *K-12 Social Studies Curriculum Guide*, 1968; *The Program of Social Studies Instruction Grades K-12*, 1969; *The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary Schools of Virginia*, 1976; *Social Studies Education Framework for California Public Schools*, 1975; *Social Studies*, 1961; *Social Studies Guide*, 1970; *Social Studies, K-12, Program of Studies*, 1974; *Social Studies in Oregon Schools*, 1955; *Social Studies Program for Idaho Public Schools, K-12*, 1974; *Social Studies in the Senior High School*, 1965; *Social Studies for Young Adolescents*, 1967; *A Study of Recent Changes in the Social Studies Program of the Public Schools*, 1964.

Table A-3

Social Studies Skill Objectives: 1955-1975

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
1. Data Interpretation	1. Students will be able to interpret data.	1.	1.	1.	1.
2. Problem Solving	2. Students will be able to identify and determine means of solving problems.	2. Students will develop the ability to solve problems.	2. Students will have the ability to use the scientific method to solve problems.	2. Students will be able to solve problems.	2. Students will be able to solve problems.
3. Critical Thinking	3. Students will be able to think critically.	3.	3. Students will be able to think critically.	3. Students will be able to think critically.	3. Students will be able to think critically.
4. Judgment	4. Students will have the ability to make critical judgments.	4.	4. Students will have the ability to make critical judgments.	4.	4. Students will be able to make valid judgments.
5. Evaluation of Information	5. Students will be able to evaluate information; to distinguish between fact and opinion.	5.	5. Students will be able to evaluate information and to make generalizations from facts.	5.	5.
6. Library Skills	6. Students will exhibit the ability to locate information in the library and the community.	6. Students will be able to use and evaluate reference materials of different kinds.	6. Students will demonstrate the ability to properly use the library.	6.	6.
7. Leadership and Followership	7. Students will demonstrate the ability to be both leaders and followers.	7.	7.	7. Students will demonstrate the ability to be both leaders and followers.	7.

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
8. Citizenship Skills	8.	8. Students will possess the skills to be responsible citizens.	8. Students will assume the responsibilities and duties of a citizen.	8. Students will demonstrate the ability to carry out their civic responsibilities.	8.
9. Economic Skills	9.	9. Students will develop the capability to be economically competent.	9. Students will develop the capability to be economically competent.	9.	9.
10. Data Gathering and Analysis	10. Students will develop reading and listening skills.	10. Students will demonstrate the ability to acquire information through listening and observing.	10. Students will demonstrate the ability to acquire information through listening and observing.	10. Students will demonstrate the ability to acquire and analyze data.	10. Students will demonstrate the ability to acquire and analyze data.
11. Inquiry Skills	11.	11. Students will be able to use inquiry skills.	11. Students will demonstrate the ability to use inquiry skills.	11. Students will demonstrate the ability to employ inquiry methods.	11. Students will possess inquiry skills.
12. Work-Study Skills	12.	12. Students will demonstrate appropriate work-study skills.	12.	12.	12. Students will possess good work-study skills.
13. Development of Potential	13.	13. Students will strive to develop their potential and abilities so as to benefit society.	13. Students will work to their full potential.	13. Students will use their potential to the fullest.	13.
14. Communication	14.	14.	14. Students will be able to express their feelings and ideas well orally or in writing.	14.	14. Students will be able to communicate well.
15. Determination of Cause and Effect	15.	15.	15. Students will be able to relate cause and effect.	15.	15.

Topic	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
16. Group and Independent Work	16.	16.	16. Students will be able to work well independently or in groups.	16.	16. Students will be able to work well in groups or independently.
17. Decision Making	17.	17.	17. Students will demonstrate the ability to make decisions.	17.	17.
18. Curiosity and Creativity	18.	18.	18. Students will strive to be creative and curious.	18. Students will strive to be curious and creative.	18. Students will strive to be curious and creative.
19. Appreciation of Beauty	19.	19.	19. Students will be able to appreciate beauty.	19.	19.
20. Continuous Growty	20.	20.	20.	20. Students will demonstrate the potential for continuous growth.	20.
21. Perception of Consequences	21.	21.	21.	21. Students will be able to perceive the possible consequences of their actions.	21.
22. Clarification of Issues	22.	22.	22.	22.	22. Students will be able to clarify issues.

Sources Used for Skill Objectives Chart

Contact, 1975; Curriculum Guide Grades 4-7, 1968; K-12 Social Studies Curriculum Guide, 1968, The Program of Social Studies Instruction Grades K-12, 1969; Proposed Social Sciences Education Framework for California Public Schools, 1970; Skill Development in Social Studies, 1963; Social Studies, 1961; Social Science Guide, K-12, 1967; The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary Schools of Virginia, 1976; Social Studies Education Framework for California Public Schools, 1975; Social Studies Guide, 1970; Social Studies Objectives, 1974; Social Studies in Oregon Secondary Schools, 1955; Social Studies in the Senior High School, 1965; Social Studies for Young Adolescents, 1967; A Study of Recent Changes in The Social Studies Program of the Public Schools, 1964; Survey-Elective Social Studies Program for Senior High Schools, 1971.

Table A-4

Scope of the Social Studies: 1955-1975

Grade Level	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Kindergarten			Home Environment - School Environment Learning how to live at home and at school; school personnel; safety and health; transportation and conservation; members of the family and their work and play; special days of the year	Home Environment - School Environment Together in the classroom and school; how the family meets its needs; some needs are met by people far away; we adapt to change; we observe special days together at home and in school; introduction to group living; social skills; introductory study to institutions	The School Community - Home - Self The development of fundamental ideas about the institution (school); benefits gained from school; how the school operates politically, economically, socially; schools past, present, future, and home; who am I?; how am I like other people?; how am I different?
Grade One	School, Home, and Farm Getting acquainted; working together; workers and helpers; a happy home; members of the family help one another; family has a good time together; farm and city families help each other		Home Environment - School Environment Good citizenship and our American heritage; maps; people who help us; seasons and holidays; homes in other lands; the world today; learning about family and school life; how to keep safe and healthy; family work and fun	Families - (School, Home, Community) People live in groups; many workers supply services; government supplies service; communities are interdependent; changes occur; special days; good citizenship; families near and far; shopping centers; current events	Families (neighborhoods) observe, examine, interpret, and discuss family membership, recreation, work, cooperation, interdependence, and traditions; a system by which families of other cultures can be examined; what roles do families play?; how is my family like other families?; how is it different?
Grade Two	Neighborhood - Community The school and the neighborhood; how our neighborhood is fed; clothed; housed; protected; how the health of the neighborhood is protected; children	Neighborhood Studies Social living; experiences at home, in school and in the neighborhood; new experiences, both direct and vicarious, in these environments.	Families and Neighborhoods Maps and globes; communication and transportation; families near and far; patriotism (symbols and citizenship); our city; current happenings around the world;	Neighborhoods - (Communities, Cities) Cities (ours and others in the U. S. and the world); communication and transportation make people closer; special days and customs; recreation; how we get our food;	Neighborhoods - (Communities) The local community; larger communities; community living (behavior, rules, responsibilities, beliefs, goods, services) my role within the community and group; what function does my neighborhood play?; how

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
	play together; how people in the neighborhood live together; how workers in our neighborhood make it a good place to live; neighborhoods as part of community			children in other lands	is my neighborhood like others?; how is it different?
Grade Three	Community The health and safety of the community; people help us learn; recreational facilities; religious opportunities; transportation and communication; government in the community; how the community began	Community Studies Our community; the activities of the community's people both today and long ago; maps; life in widely scattered communities; influence of physical conditions on people and their activities	Community Maps; history and geography of our community; our community today; patriotism; homes, clothing and communication in our community; understanding community differences and growth; concepts of time, distance, and the past	Communities - (Cities) Communities of our state; city communities in our state and nation; citizenship and responsibility in the community; selected communities of the world (past and present); various economic types of communities	Communities - (Cities) Communities in other countries; our local community; likeness in all communities; what is the function of the community?; differences in communities
Grade Four	Climatic and Geographic Regions of the World Ways to make a living; transportation; people and products; communication; health and safety; people who help us grow in knowledge; wholesome leisure-time activities--all pertain to various regions of the world	Beginning Readiness for History and Geography Regions of the World Ways of living in contrasting geographical regions of the world; the study of our own state	World Communities - (History and Geography) Learning to think geographically; geographic, economic and climatic regions of the world (forest, desert, farming, fishing, manufacturing, trading); our state; government in other lands; the way people live and adapt to their environment in various parts of the world	Geographic and Cultural Regions Learning to think geographically; climatic and physical regions of the world; people of the world; our state; climatic regions (hot-wet; hot-dry) physical regions (highland; lowland)	State History World Geography analysis of one state so that you can analyze any of them; problems of our state; solutions for our state; what function does my state play?; how is my state like other states?; how is it different?; how are geographic regions around the world alike?; how are they different?

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Grade Five	United States History and Geography Why early people came to America?; how did pioneers get necessities?; how did natural resources influence their lives?; people and events related to significant changes (social, economic, historical, political); how did Hawaii and Alaska become important to U. S.?; what are some of the needs of our country today?	United States History The story of our country yesterday and today; emphasis on geographic regions of the U. S.; historical emphasis on early periods of exploration, discovery and settlement	United States History Early explorations; colonial living; how our community grew; map-skills--physical geography; industrialization of U. S.; war between the states; our nation reunities; U. S. and world today; regions of U. S.	United States History Early exploration; colonial living; westward movement; war between the states and reconstruction; U. S. as a world leader; regions of U. S.	United States History Environment and locations within the U. S.; knowledge and life-styles within the U. S.; democracy within the U. S.; careers in U. S.; economics; U. S. involvement in world affairs; values of the American people; effective citizenship; regions in U. S.; historical traditions
Grade Six	The Western Hemisphere Exploration in neighboring countries; natural resources; people and contributions; problems of our neighbors; solutions; participation in world affairs	The Western Hemisphere The study of our American neighbors--Latin America and Canada with their geographic, cultural, economic and political backgrounds	America's Neighbors - The Western Hemisphere Canada and Latin America-geographic facts about the parts of each area; history of settlement; uses of resources; growth of society to present status	The Western Hemisphere Latin America geography; exploration and development; modern Latin America; problems; interdependency of the Western Hemisphere; relationship to the environment	World Cultures Family life, beliefs, values, economic and political systems, environment from prehistoric times to present day of a variety of cultures; introduction of anthropological concepts; comparative cultures; some emphasis still on Western Hemisphere

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Grade Seven	The Eastern Hemisphere Early man; European nations' problems; emerging Asia; Africa; Australia and the East Indies in world affairs; U. S. shows how free people can govern themselves	The World Historical and geographical emphasis; the beginning of civilization through modern times--the Far East; India; Russia and the satellite countries; Germany and Middle Europe; interdependence; adaptations to environment; work and resources; social organizations	The Eastern Hemisphere - State History History and geography of the Mediterranean area and the Middle East; the Far East; Africa culture studies; some correlation with literature; state exploration and settlement; colonial period in state; emerging; early industry;economics of state; cities of state; state government-local government--civics	World Cultures Selected nations of the world are studied; cultural approach	World Cultures - (Eastern Hemisphere) - State History Geography; culture; relations with other nations; independence movements; economic problems; poverty; gaps between rich and poor; struggle for stabilized governments
Grade Eight	The United States - State History Colonists and pioneers; westward movement; agriculture to industry; rural to urban; U. S. responsibility as a world power—emphasis on history, geography, government—tie state in	United States History - State History Our American story with major emphasis on the middle period of American history developing the expanding concept of American democracy with the growth of our country; how Americans have enriched their lives	United States History Chronological study--study of U. S. Constitution; exploration; colonization; independence; national-republican period; age of Jackson; division and reunion; economic expansion; U. S. as world power; globes, projections, atlases—emphasis on government resources	United States History Chronological approach; Exploration; colonization; new nation; early years of republic; western influence and manifest destiny; the great crises; America enters the machine age; the U. S. becomes a world power; the U. S. faces the world of tomorrow	United States History Chronological approach; exploration; colonization; formation of government; documents in U. S. history; westward movement; wars in America's history; economic changes; U. S. involvement in world affairs

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Grade Nine	World Geography and Historical Backgrounds Early civilizations; earth, universe, atmosphere, land, water, other resources; trade; transportaion, communication; Lands (British Isles, France, Germany, Russia, India, China, Japan, North America, South America)	Civics Government (local, state, and national)	Civics - World Geography Social, political and economic citizenship; city and county government; geography and food, clothing, resources; studies of specific areas; current events; career education	Civics - Non Western World Culture Studies national, state, and local governmental structure; governmental procedures; democratic processes; respect and loyalty; interest in civic affairs; responsibility; compare and analyze governments	World Cultures - State History Cultural studies of the non-western world; relationship of environment and culture; cultural change; religions; evolutions of arts; cultural diffusion
Grade Ten	World History and Geographic Settings Interaction of man and earth; civilization-relative and changing; citizenship begins in early Greece and Rome; religion as a force in history; the Renaissance; nationalism-definitions, causes, and results; democracy-past and present; science and industry change the world; our world today	World History Emphasis on the developing stream of history from the past to the present with emphasis on the development of western civilization	World History Early civilizations; middle ages; democracy (development and influence); imperialism; conflicting ideologies; revolutions; cold war; inter relationships among nations	World History Prehistoric and ancient times; Feudalism and the church in middle ages; Renaissance and reformation; emergence of nationalism; revolutions; world conflicts; the non-western world	World History Ancient world; middle ages; Renaissance; reformation; revolution; intellectual, political, and economic changes; the world today (problems, cooperation); cultures

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Grade Eleven	American History and Government Foundations of the republic; expansion of the nation; industrial, economic, and social progress in the U. S.; U. S. and other nations; government (local, state, national)	American History Designed to build on and deepen the backgrounds developed in elementary and junior high, analysis of problems and concepts too difficult on those levels; emphasis on U. S. world setting and role of leadership	American History The growth and development of early America; U. S. meets its problems as a growing nation; changing America; three decades of decision 1914-1945; U. S. since World War II--evaluation of world leadership	American History - American Studies Emphasis on modern America; current interests and concerns; comparison of U.S.'s and Soviet Union's governments; pluralism; social and cultural development of nation	American History - American Studies Topical studies of American people, government and politics, economic, culture (civilization), foreign policy; chronological studies emphasizing themes
Grade Twelve	American Problems Being a well-balanced person; problems of family living; critical thinking and public opinion; consumer problems; government in a democracy; labor-management relations; delinquency and crime; international relations; economic and social enterprising; natural resources; social and economic implications of scientific advancement; intercultural relations; American public education	Problems of Democracy Builds on all social studies in preceding years; political, economic, and social problems considered constructively	Problems of Democracy Comparative governments; U. N.; economic issues; foreign affairs; intercultural relations; trade; personal problems; juvenile delinquency; conservation; education	Problems of Democracy The nature of American democracy and the role of the individual; urban America-megalopolis; youth; narcotics and drug abuse; ecological crisis; crime and the law; social dissent and the law	

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Grade Twelve (con't)		Sociology Concerned with man as a member of social groups, and his behavior as a member of these groups; basic sociological concepts such as culture, conflicting values and beliefs and social institutions	Sociology Concepts of discipline; models and significant sociological studies; intergroup relations; family, marriage, and divorce	Sociology Study of humans; social structure; social forces; social behavior; social data; basic problems within our society	Sociology Ways in which human societies have evolved; effects that belonging to particular groups have on an individual's behavior; implications of cultural diversity; social groups as link between society and individual; social-class systems; social mobility; effects of population; crime and violence on individual and society
			Government National government--structure and functions; foreign policy and defense; state and local government--structure and functions; public opinion, pressure groups, and politics; taxation; privileges and responsibilities of citizenship; philosophy of government	Government Obligations of government and citizens; comparative governments; evolution of U. S. system of government; study the U. S. Constitution	Government Who shall be the rulers or representatives of the people?; taxation; services of government; informal and formal institutions of government; political behavior; foreign policy and national security; political parties; the media and interest groups

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Grade Twelve (con't)			**Psychology** personal adjustment; limitations and uses of psychology; family relationships; boy-girl relationships; values and limitations of emotional experiences; personality and character formation; preparation for future (single-married roles); facts and methods of discipline; understand self	**Psychology** Behavior; differentiate between science and pseudo-science; field of psychology; careers in psychology; psychological techniques	**Psychology** Stress on mental health; perception; motivation; cognition; and psychometrics; social and clinical psychology
		Economics Basic principles of free enterprise system related to our political philosophy; contrasting economic systems	**Economics** Consumption; production; capital; demand and supply; money, credit and banking; distribution of personal income; the government and the economy; international trade and tariffs; economic responsibilities	**Economics** Consumer education; free enterprise system; money and banking; business organization; investment; demand and supply; role of consumer; international trade; ideal economic models	**Economics** Production; resources; quantity; role of economic growth; consumer education; distribution; free enterprise; economic systems; economic issues and problems; management of personal economic affairs; economics and the environment; market mechanisms; money and banking

	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Grade Twelve (con't)				Anthropology Concept of culture; anthropological terms; evolution of life; archaeology; family; kinship and marriage; cooperation and conflict among societies; religion and magic, arts, theories of culture and society	Anthropology Basic concepts; various fields; physical and cultural anthropology; application of anthropology to solving problems; observation and collection of data; ways in which cultures are passed on and changed;
					Geography Spatial arrangements and associations; interpretation and evaluation of physical features of Earth; interrelationships between people and habitat; cultural landscape; environment; distributional patterns; Earth as the world of humans

Sources Used in Scope Chart

American History (American Studies), 1971; The American Way, 1976; Black Studies, 1970; Career Education, 1974; Citizenship, 1974; Citizenship and the Social Studies 1975-1976, 1976; Consumer Education in the Secondary Curriculum, 1972; Economic Concepts, 1974; Economic Education in California Public Schools, 1975; Environmental-Ecological Education, 1971; Framework for the Social Studies in Wyoming, Grades K-12, 1969; Fundamentals of the Free Enterprise System, 1975; Introduction to Economics, 1971; Introduction to Psychology, 1971; Introduction to Sociology, 1973; Minorities in American Society, 1971; National Assessement of Educational Progress, 1969; Problems of Democracy for Secondary Schools, Learning Materials and Activities, 1971; Profile of the Current Secondary Social Studies Curriculum in North Central Association Schools, 1963; Program Improvement for Social Studies Education in Wisconsin, ? (recently 1975-1977); Psychology and Sociology, 1967; A Resource Project in Social Studies, 1967; Social Science Guide K-12, 1967; Social Studies, 1961; Social Studies, 1971; Social Studies Education Framework for California Public Schools, 1975; Social Studies Guide, 1970; Social Studies in Oregon Secondary Schools, 1955; Social Studies in Secondary Schools, 1964; Social Studies in the Senior High School, 1965; Social Studies for Young Adolescents, 1967; Teaching About Communism, 1964;

Table A-5

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

Down the lefthand side of the table are enumerated the various aspects of materials that have been analyzed. In the second column are listed the studies analyzing each particular aspect listed. The studies are listed by name of author. Underneath the author's name in parentheses is indicated what sort of format the study appeared in (e.g., monograph, journal article, dissertation). Then, to the right of the author's name are provided four key pieces of information about the particular study: the date of its publication (or appearance, if unpublished); the type of texts analyzed in the study (e.g., general social studies, American history, psychology); the number of texts analyzed; and the grade level(s) of the texts analyzed. These four pieces of information appear in one of four columns, depending on the period in which the analysis was done (1955-59, 1960-64, 1965-69, or 1970-75+). It is hoped that this four-period arrangement will help readers see more clearly any changes in analytic activity that may have occurred over time.

Table A-5

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
1. Treatment of Social Science Concepts and/or Methods																	
a. General	Dimitroff (Diss.)	58	Soc. St.	30	4-6												
	* Dimitroff (j. art.)	61	Soc. St.	30	4-6												
	Chew (Diss.)									66	Soc. St.	19	2				
	Ratcliffe (Diss.)									66	Am. Hist.	6	11				
	Israel (Diss.)													70	Soc. St.	7	4-6
	Palmer (Chap.)									67	Am. Hist.	5	10-12				
	Brufke (Diss.)													72	Am. Hist.	6	10-12
b. Anthropology	Awkard (Diss.)					64	Soc. St.	30	5-6								
	Dynneson (Diss.)													72	Anthro.	6	K-12
	Dynneson (Paper)													75	Soc. St.	21	K-12
	Dynneson (Book)													75	Soc. St.	21	K-12
	Sady (Paper)					63?	World hist.	13	10-12								

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
c. Economics	Textbook CTTEE... AEA (j. art.)					63	Econ., Soc. Problems, Am. Hist.	24	10-12								
	Tarter (Diss.)									69	Am. Hist.	8	10-12				
	Townshend-Zellner (j. art.)													70	Econ.	12	10-12
	Laner (Diss.)													73	Econ.	8	10-12
	Davison et al. (Monog.)													75	Soc. St.	5 Series	1-6
	Rader & Metcalf (Chap.)									67	Econ.	3	10-12				
	Alexander (j. art.)									69	Am. Hist.	?	?				
	Tullock & Johnson (j. art.)									66	Econ.	9	10-12				
	Davison et al. (monog.)													73	Soc. St.	10 series	1-6
	Watson et al. (monog.)													73	Soc. St.	39	7-9
	Weidenaar et al. (monog.)													73	Govt., POD, Geog., soc., anthro.	27	10-12
	O'Neill (monog.)													73	US hist., world hist.	19	11-12
	Davis (chap.)													77	Econ.	18	1-12

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
d. Geography	Haslem (j. art.)	55	Soc. St.	4	6												
	Cadugan (Diss.)	58	Econ., Geog.	34	10-12												
	Langhans (Diss.)					61	W. Hist., Am. Hist., Geog.	43	7-12								
	Mensoian (Diss.)					61	Geog., Soc. St.	8 Series	5-6								
	Greco (Chap.)									67	Geog.	9	10-12				
e. Political Science	Smith (Diss.)									66	Govt., Civics, P.O.D.	33	10-12				
	Adelson & Crosby (Book)													71	NSS	9	7-12
	Turner (Book													71	NSS	49	K-12
	Gillespie (j. art.)													75	Govt.	5	10-12
	Goldstein (MA Thesis)									?	Soc. St.	30	1-6				
	Comm on Pre-Collegiate... (j. art.)													71	Soc. St.	?	1-12
	≠ Alexander (j. art.)									69	Am. Hist.	?	?				

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
	Massialas (Chap.)									67	Am. Govt.	6	9-12				
	Smith & Patrick (Chap.)									67	Civics	12	7-9				
f. Psychology	# Awkard (Diss.)					64	Soc. St.	30	5-6								
	Girault (Chap.)									67	Psych.	2	10-12				
	Psychology Teacher's... (Monog.)													73	Psych.	51	10-12
g. Sociology	# Awkard (Diss.)					64	Soc. St.	30	5-6								
	# Girault (Chap.)									67	Soc.	2	10-12				
	Hering (Paper)									66	Soc.	5	10-12				

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

		1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
Aspect Analyzed	Author	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
2. Treatment of Specific Concepts or Themes																	
a. Violence	Ellenwood (Diss.)													70	Am. Hist.	5	10-12
b. Urbanism	Sublett (Diss.)													72	Am. Hist.	154	11
c. Social Conflicts	Fox (Diss.)													72	Soc. St.	58	3,5,9
*	Fox & Hess (Monog.)													72	Soc. St.	?	3,5,9
d. Social Change	Palmer (Diss.)					60	Hist.	?	10-12								
*	Palmer (j. art.)					61	Hist.	?	?								
e. Religion	Howley (Diss.)	59	Am. Hist.	?	7-8												
	Harris (Book)					63	Soc. St.	?	1-6								
	McMillan (Diss.)													70	Soc. St.	?	10-12

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
f. Foreign Affairs	Gilbert (Diss.)	55	Am. Hist.	?	7-8												
g. US-Japan Relations	Tamashiro (Diss.)													72	Am. Hist.	8	10-12
h. Values & Affect	Lemmond (Diss.)					64	Soc. St.	9	5								
	Shive (Diss.)									69	NSS	3	9-12				
	Martorella (Paper)													73	Soc. St.	4	P-3
	Superka et al. (Book)													76	Soc. St.	84	K-12
	Shaver (j. art.)									65	Am. Govt., Am. Probs., Civics	93	7-12				
	Chesler (Chap.)									67	P.O.D.	2	10-12				
i. Famous People	Zimmerman (Diss.)									67	Soc. St.	18	1-6				
	Rogers & Zimmerman (j. art.)									69	Soc. St.	?	1-6				

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
j. Govt. Involvement in the Economy	Yielding (Diss.)									67	Am. Hist.	?	10-12				
k. Quantitative Content	Wilson (Diss.)	58	Soc. St. & Arith.	?	1-6												
	Jarolimek & Foster (j. art.)	59	Soc. St.	?	5												
	Jensen (Diss.)									69	Soc. St.	?	4, 6				
l. Ecology	Arrington (Diss.)													72	Soc. St.	30	3-6
m. Occupational Concepts & Information	Fitzgerald (Diss.)									69	Soc. St.	?	1-6				
	Horner (Diss.)													75	Soc. St.	28	1-6
n. Cultural Relativity	Berlin (Diss.)													72	Soc. St.	7	5

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
o. Communism	Berman (Diss.)													75	W. Hist.	42	7-12 ?
	Root (Book)	58	Am. Hist.	11	10-12												
p. Labor Movement	Sloan (Monog.)													74	Am. Hist. & Govt.	27	10-12
q. Global Dimensions	Spurgin & Smith (Monog.)													73	NSS	14	K-12
r. National Bias	Billington et al. (Book)									66	Am. Hist.	?	?				
s. Image of Public Schools	Alilunas (j. art.)					63	Rom. Cath. Am. Hist.	?	?								
t. Supremacy of Law	Epstein (Diss.)	56	Soc. St.	36	10-12												
u. Social Security	Myers (j. art.)	56	Civics	?	10-12												

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

		1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
Aspect Analyzed	Author	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
3. Treatment of Historical Content and Methods																	
a. General	Durham (Diss.)													71	Am. Hist.	42	10-12
	Cremer (Diss.)					63	W. Hist.	?	10-12								
	Cox (Chap.)									67	Am. Hist.	?	7-9				
	Hines (Chap.)									67	W. Hist.	24	10-12				
	Noah, Prince, & Riggs (j. art.)					62	Am. Hist.	11	?								
	≠ Alexander (j. art.)									69	Am. Hist.	?	?				
	Alexander (j. art.)					60	Am. Hist.	?	?								
b. Reconstruction	Krug (j. art.)					61	Am. Hist.	?	?								
c. Slavery	McPherson (j. art.)									67	?	?	?				

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
d. Populism	Feiser (j. art.)													73	Am. Hist.	9	10-12
4.* Epistemology and Learning Theory a. Cognitive Levels ≠																	
	Wadleigh (Diss.)									69	Am. Hist.	58	5,8,11				
≠	Chew									66	Soc. St.	19	2				
b. Concept Development	Manolakes (j. art.)	58	Soc. St.	?	1-6												
c. Use of "Inquiry" Approach	Baringer (Diss.)									69	Am. Hist.	?	10-12				
	Cousins (Chap.)									67	State Hist.	15	7-9				

*Many of the studies listed under #1 (Soc. Sci.) and #3 (Hist.) deal with modes of inquiry and concepts used in the social sciences and history and thus, might be relevant to b, c, and d below.

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
d. Types of Explanation Used	Urick (Diss.)									65	Am. Hist.	10	10-12				
e. Presence of Structures of Knowledge	Thompson (Diss.)													70	Am. Hist.	3	?
f. Reflective ≠ Thinking	Shaver (j. art.)									65	Am. Govt., Am. Probs., Civics	43	7-12				
5. Treatment of Unspecified or General ≠ Social Studies Content	Lorow (Diss.)									66	Soc. St.	?	9				
	[illegible] (D[illegible])													71	Am. Hist.	42	10-12
	Joyce (Chap.)									67	Soc. St.	?	1-3				
	Rader (Chap.)									67	Soc. St.	?	4-6				
6. Treatment of Minorities a. General	Marcus (Book)					61	?	?	7-12								
	Michigan... (Rept)					63	?	?	?								

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
	Slotkin (j. art.)					64	?	?	?								
	Golden (Diss.)					64	Soc. St.	?	1-3								
	House of Reps... (Hearing Record)									66	?	?	?				
•	Golden (j. art.)									66	Soc. St.	?	1-3				
	Roberts (j. art.)									67	?	?	1-6				
	Michigan... (Rept.)									68	Am. Hist.	?	?				
	Kane (Book)													70	Am. Hist., W. Hist., Govt/ Civics	45	most 10-12
	Mitchell (MA Thesis)													71	Soc. St.	19	8
	Joyce (j. art.)													73	Soc. St.	8	1-3
	Tresize (Rept.)													74	Soc. St.	11	Late Elem -12
	Simms (j. art.)													75	Am. Hist.	?	5-8
	Zimmerman (j. art.)													75	Soc. St.	?	4-6

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
b. Blacks	Stampp et al. (j. art.)					64	Am. Hist.	?	?								
	Miller (j. art.)									65	Hist.	?	?				
	Sloan (Book)									67	Am. Hist.	?	?				
	Harris (j. art.)									69	Soc. St.	?	1-6				
	Banks (Diss.)									69	Am. Hist.	36	4-8				
	McLaurin (j. art.)													71	State Hist.	7	?
	Turetsky (j. art.)													74	Basal Readers & Soc. St.	126	1-3
	Price & Spencer (j. art)													70	Soc. St.	?	1-6
c. Sexism	Trecker (j. art.)													71	Am. Hist.	13	?
	Scardina (Monog.)													72	Soc. St., Lang., Rdng., Sci., & Math	36	K-5
	McLeod & Silverman (Monog.)													73	Am. Govt.	8	10-1
	O'Donnell (j. art.)													73	Soc. St.	?	1-2
	Weitzman & Rizzo (j. art.)													75	Soc. St., Sci., Rdng., Arith., Spell	?	1-6

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
d. Mexican-Americans	Sandoval (Diss.)													72	Soc. St.	30	5
e. American Indians	Vogel (j. art.)									68	Am. Hist.	?	?				
f. Asian-Americans	Lee (Diss.)													72	Soc. St.	?	?
	Yee (j. art.)													73	Soc. St.	?	1-12
	Barlow (Diss.)													73	W. Hist.	?	7-12 ?
	Hata & Hata (Paper)													74	Am. Hist.	40 +	?
g. Intergroup Relations	Mudd (Diss.)					61	Soc. St.	?	?								
	Harris (j. art.)					63	Soc. St.	?	?								
h. Racial & Cultural Diversity	Anderson (Rept.)									66	Soc. St.	?	1-6				

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
7. Treatment of Foreign Areas																	
a. Mexico	Kranyik (Diss.)									65	Soc. St.	8	5-6				
b. Latin America	Perrone (Rept.)									65	?	?	2-12				
	Sentell (Diss.)													74	Soc. St.	?	1-6
c. China	Wong (Diss.)													71	W. Hist., W. Geog.	12	10-12
d. Japan	Kambayashi (Monog.)													75	Am. Hist.	64	10-12
e. India	Duggal (Diss.)									69	Soc. St., W. Geog., W. Hist.	72	1-12				
	Kennedy (Diss.)					60	Geog. & Integrated Soc. St. series	9	1-9								
	Chacko (Diss.)													70	W. Hist.	7	10-12

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
f. Asia	Hartshorn (j. art.)	57	?	?	?												
	Asia Soc. (Book)													76	Soc. St.	306	K-12
	Robbins (j. art.)					61	Geog., Hist.	4	7-12								
g. Soviet Union	Frost (j. art.)													74	Soc. St.	?	7-12
≠	Berman (Diss.)													75	W. Hist.	27	7-12 ?
h. Middle East	Griswold (Monog.)													75	Soc. St.	42	7-12 ?
≠	Kennedy (Diss.)					60	Geog., & integrated Soc. St.	9 series	1-9								
8. Types of Objectives																	
a. Affective	Cummings (Diss.)													71	NSS	30	10-12
	Schisler (Diss.)													71	NSS	27	7-9

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
b. Other ≠	Cremer (Diss.)					63	W. Hist.	?	7-12								
≠	Dorow (Diss.)									66	Soc. St.	?	9				
9. Illustrations, Media, Documents	Dusenbery (Diss.)					64	Soc. St.	6 sets	4-6								
	Julianda (Diss.)									69	Soc. St. & Math	32 & 47	1-6				
≠	Durham (Diss.)													71	Am. Hist.	42	10-12
10. Readability	Zahnister (Diss.)	55	Econ.	?	7-12												
	Haffner (Diss.)	59	Soc. St., Hist., & Geog.	?	5-6												
	Sloan (Diss.)	59	Soc. St.	7 Series	4-6												
	Arnsdorf (j. art.)					63	Soc. St.	?	1-6 ?								
≠	Dusenbery (Diss.)					64	Soc. St.	6 Sets	4-6								
	Lidberg (Diss.)									65	Soc. St.	9	4-6				
	Janz (Diss.)									69	Soc. St., Eng., Sci.	40	8-10				

Content Analyses of Social Studies Texts

(Abbreviations are spelled out and symbols explained in Key at end.)

Aspect Analyzed	Author	1955-59				1960-64				1965-69				1970-75+			
		Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade	Date	Type of Texts	No.	Grade
	Bryant (Diss.)													71	Soc St., Sci., Eng., Lit.	?	10-12
	Causey (Diss.)													71	Soc. St. & McGuffey's Readers	?	4-6
11. Multiple Aspects Analyzed, Including Content, Objectives, Teaching Strategies	Sanders & Tanck (j. art.)													70	NSS	26	K-12
	SSEC Data Book (Book)													71-pres.	Soc. St.	400 +	K-12
	New In-Depth... (j. art.)													72	NSS	26	K-12
	Crosby (Book)													73	Soc. St.	36	7-12
	Secondary School... (Book)													76	Soc. St.	31	7-12
12. Unclear	Dickson (Diss.)													72	NSS	11	?

Key

for Content Analyses Table

Symbols

*Starred item is probably taken from dissertation by same author. Dissertation is listed previously.

≠Same work was listed previously. (Reason for listing more than once: work analyzed more than one aspect.)

?Information not supplied in abstract, annotation, or work itself. (Sometimes accompanied by information indicating an educated guess by compiler of the table.)

Abbreviations

Type of Text:

Soc. St. = Social studies in general; no specific fields indicated or all fields indicated
Am. Hist. = American History
W. Hist. = World History
W. Geog. = World Geography
Geog. = Geography
Econ. = Economics
Anthro. = Anthropology
Psych. = Psychology
Soc. = Sociology
Govt. = Government
Poli. Sci. = Political Science
P.O.D. = Problems of Democracy
NSS = "New Social Studies"
Arith. = Arithmetic
Math. = Mathematics
Rom. Cath. = Roman Catholic
Sci. = Science
Rdng. = Reading
Spell. = Spelling
Eng. = English
Lit. = Literature

Type of work (Under Author):
Diss. = Doctoral Dissertation
j. art. = Journal Article
Monog. = Monograph
Rept. = Report (Usually unpublished)
MA Thesis = Master's Thesis
Chap. = Chapter in a Book

Grade Level:
Intermed. = Intermediate grades, specific levels not given
Elem. = Elementary, specific levels not given
P. = Preschool

Table A-6

SOCIAL STUDIES/SOCIAL SCIENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHING CERTIFICATE

(See pages 65-66 for explanatory notes.)

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Alabama	18 hrs. soc. st., incl. at least 4 in each of 3: hist, econ, pol sci, soc, geog	18 hrs. soc st., incl. at least 3 in each of 3: hist, econ, pol sci, soc, geog	18 hrs. soc. sci., incl. at least 3 in each of 3: hist, econ, pol sci, soc, anthro, geog
Alaska	NA (not yet a state)	0	0
Arizona	0	Arizona & Federal Constitution--hrs. not specified	beh sci (hrs not specified
Arkansas	12 hrs. soc sci, hist, incl. 3 hrs. in geog	12 hrs soc sci, incl. 3 hrs in geog and 6 hrs in Am hist and govt	12 hrs soc st, incl. 3 hrs in US hist, 3 in US govt, 3 in geog, 3 in econ
California	exam or 2 hrs in Principles & Provisions of the Contitution of the US	0	same as 1955-56
Colorado	0	0	0
Connecticut	6 hrs. soc. sci., incl. US hist.	same as 1955-56	same as 1955-56
Delaware	0	4-6 hrs. soc. sci.	3 hrs. soc. sci.
D.C.	0	0	0
Florida	6-12 hrs. soc. sci.	same as 1955-56	6-12 hrs. soc. sci.
Georgia	13 1/3 hrs. soc. st., incl. Am. hist. & econ.	20 q. hrs. soc. st.	0
Hawaii	NA (not state yet)	0	0
Idaho	12 hrs. soc. st., incl. Am hist. & govt.	12 hrs. soc. sci., incl. Am. hist. &/or govt.	12 hrs. soc. sci., incl. US hist. &/or govt.

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Illinois	16-18 hrs. soc. sci., incl. Am. hist. &/or govt.	6 hrs. soc. sci., incl. Am. Hist. &/ or govt.	7 hrs. soc. sci., incl. Am. hist. &/ or govt.
Indiana	15 hrs. soc. st. (contemporary civ., Europ. backgrounds, Am. hist.)	15 hrs. soc. st.	same as 1965-66
Iowa	"preparation" in geog., soc. & econ. hist. of US, contemp. soc. & econ. probs.	0	0
Kansas	10 hrs. soc. sci., incl. hist.	10 hrs. soc. sci.	13 hrs. hist. & soc. & beh. sci.
Kentucky	21 hrs. soc. st., incl. 9 hrs. in econ., hist, & govt, & geog.	18 hrs. soc. sci., 12-18 hrs "pre-professional preparation" in foundations of phil., psych., soc., & anthro.	18 hrs. soc. sci.
Louisiana	12 hrs. soc. st. (hist., econ., soc., geog., pol. sci., & survey of soc. sci), incl. 3-6 in US hist.; plus 3 hrs. gen. geog. & 3 hrs. state hist./geog.	same as 1955-56	same as 1955-56
Maine	0	0	0
Maryland	0	15 hrs. soc. st., incl. 3 hrs. geog. & 9 hrs. hist. (6 US)	15 hrs. soc. st., incl. 3 hrs. geog. & 9 hrs. hist.
Massachusetts	0	0	0
Michigan	0	0	0
Minnesota	0	0	0
Mississippi	6 hrs. world hist., & 6 hrs. geog., pol. sci., soc., econ., phil., relig., and/or psych.	6 hrs. world &/or Am. hist. & 6 hrs. geog., pol. sci., soc., econ., phil., relig., &/or psych.	6 hrs. world or Am. hist. & 6 hrs. other soc. st. except relig.

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Missouri	5 hrs. Am. hist., 2 hrs. US & state govt., 2 hrs. geog., 3 hrs. other soc. st. or excess credit	same as 1955-56	same as 1955-56
Montana	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0
New Jersey	6 hrs soc. st.	same as 1955-56	0
New Mexico	6 hrs. soc. st.	3 hrs. soc. st.	same as 1965-66
New York	0	0	0
North Carolina	6 hrs. Am. hist., 2-3 hrs. givt., 6 hrs. geog.	12 hrs. soc. & beh. sci. & 14 hrs. soc. st.	0
North Dakota	0	0	0
Ohio	0	18 hrs. soc. st., incl. Am. hist. or govt.	18 hrs. soc. sci., incl. Am. hist. or govt.
Oklahoma	State hist. (hrs. not specified), 6 hrs. Am. hist. & govt.	State hist. (hrs. not specified), 6 hrs. Am. hist., 2-3 hrs. geog.	6 hrs. Am. hist. & Am. govt., 2-3 hrs. geog.
Oregon	1 1/3 hrs. state hist.	"College preparation" in soc. sci.	"Demonstrated competency or college preparation" in soc. sci.
Pennsylvania	0	6 hrs. soc. sci.	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0
South Carolina	12 hrs. soc. st. (at least 3 fields)	12 hrs. soc. st. (2 fields, no more than 6 in each)	same as 1965-66
South Dakota	2 hrs. US govt. &/or hist., 2 hrs. contemp. hist., 2 hrs. elective soc. sci.	2 hrs. US govt., 2 hrs. Am. hist., 2 hrs. elective soc. sci.	same as 1965-66

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Tennessee	12 hrs. soc. st.	same as 1955-56	20 hrs. soc. st.
Texas	2 hrs. Texas & Federal Constitution or 6 hrs. Am. govt.	3 hrs. Federal & Texas Constitutions; 6 hrs. Am. hist.	Same as 1965-66
Utah	10 q. hrs. soc. sci.	Same as 1955-56	0
Vermont	0	0	"adequate background" in soc. st.
Virginia	12 hrs. soc. st., incl. US hist.	15 hrs. soc. sci., incl. course in US hist.	15 hrs. soc. sci., incl. Am. hist. & basic econ.
Washington	2 hrs. state hist. & govt.; 11 1/3 hrs. soc. st.	0	0
West Virginia	soc. sci.: 6 hrs. development of soc. institutions; 6 hrs. fund. soc. probs.; 3 hrs. state hist., geog., & govt.; 3 hrs. world geog.	soc. sci.: 6 hrs. development of soc. instits. (hist. of West. civ.); 6 hrs. fund. soc. probs.; 3 hrs. world geog.; 3 hrs. unspecified	12+ (not clear) hrs. soc. st.
Wisconsin	0	0	0
Wyoming	Soc. st. (hrs. not specified)	soc. sci. (hrs. not specified)	soc. sci. (hrs. not specified)

Table A-7

SOCIAL STUDIES/SOCIAL SCIENCE REQUIREMENTS
FOR SECONDARY TEACHING CERTIFICATE IN SOCIAL STUDIES

(See pages 65-66 for explanatory notes.)

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Alabama	Major: 24-30 hrs. & Minor: 18 hrs.; 18 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.) incl. at least 4 hrs. each in 2 soc. st.: hist., econ., pol. sci., soc., geog.	Same as 1955-56	Major: 24-30 hrs. & Minior: 18 hrs.; 12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.) incl. at least 3 hrs. each in 2 soc. sci.: hist., econ., pol. sci., soc., anthro., geog.; and 3 hrs. in psych.
Alaska	NA (not yet a state)	Major hrs. not specified	Major hrs. not specified
Arizona	Major: 24 hrs. & Minor: 15 hrs.	Major: 30 hrs; beh. sci. (hrs. not specified); Arizona & Federal Constitution	Same as 1965-66
Arkansas	12 hrs. soc. sci., incl. hist. (gen. ed.); 20 hrs. soc. sci.	12 hrs. soc. sci., (gen. ed.); 24 hrs. soc. st.	12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.) incl. 3 hrs. US hist. & 3 US govt; 24 hrs. soc. st.
California	6 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); Major: 36 hrs.; Minor: 20 hrs. (allowable areas: US hist. alone or 3 fields from geog., pol. sci., econ., soc., anthro.)	Major: 24 hrs. Minor: 20 hrs.	exam or 2 hrs. of provisions & principles of US Constitution; Major hrs not specified.
Colorado	Major hrs. not specified.	Major hrs. not specified.	Major hrs. not specified.

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Connecticut	6 hrs. soc. sci., incl. US hist. (gen. ed); 18 hrs. hist. (US, European, world) & 12 hrs. in another field; or 30 hrs. in soc. sci. (hist., pol. sci., contemp. civ., econ., soc., geog., international relations, govt.--at least 4 fields incl. Europ. & US hist.)	6 hrs. soc. st. (incl. US hist. (gen. ed.); & 18 hrs. hist. (incl. US & European or world) or 15 hrs. hist. (incl. US & world or European) plus 15 in 3 of following: govt., econ., soc., geog., international relaations.	6 hrs. soc. st. (incl. US hist. (gen. ed.); & 18 hrs. hist., (incl. US & world or European) or 15 hrs. hist. (incl. US & world or European) plus 15 in 3 of following: govt., econ., soc., geog., international relations
Delaware	18 hrs. soc. st. & 6 hrs. US hist.	4-6 hrs. soc. sci. (gen. ed.); 30 hrs. soc. st., incl. 4-6 hrs. US hist., 2-3 hrs. each western civ., modern world hist., US govt., econ., & geog.	36 hrs. in soc. st.
D.C.	Exam in major & minor subjects	Major: 30 hrs.	Major: 30 hrs.
Florida	6-12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); & 30 hrs. soc. st.	6-12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); 30 hrs. soc. st.	6-12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); 30 hrs. soc. st.
Georgia	13 1/3 hrs soc. st. incl. Am. hist. & econ. (gen. ed.); 33 1/3 hrs. in soc. st. (geog., econ., soc., pol. sci., & at least 13 1/3 hrs. in hist.)	20 q. hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); 50 q. hrs. soc. st. (incl. 20 hrs. hist., incl., US hist.)	50 q. hrs. soc. sci.; 40 q. hrs. hist. (incl. 10 Am. & 10 European); or 40 q. hrs. econ.; or 40 q. hrs. pol. sci.; or 60 q. hrs. beh. sci. (incl. soc., psych., & anthro. w/ 40 hrs. concentration in one & 10 in each of other two)
Hawaii	NA (not yet a state)	24 hrs. major; 12 hrs. minor	Major hrs. not specified

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Idaho	15 hrs. in each of 2 fields	30 hrs. major; 20 hrs. minor	30 hrs. major & 20 hrs. minor; or 45 hrs. in single field; must have 6 hrs. Am. hist., 3 hrs. Am. govt., & rest in world hist., geog., soc., & econ.
Illinois	6 hrs. soc. sci. incl. Am. hist. &/ or govt. (gen. ed.); 32 hrs. major; 16 hrs. minor	32 hrs. major & 16 hrs. minor; or 3 minors of 16, 20, & 24 hrs. each; must incl. Am. hist. &/or govt.	32 hrs. major; or 3 minors of 18, 20, & 24 hrs. each
Indiana	Soc. st.--3 options: I-10 hrs. gen. hist., 10 hrs. US hist., 4 hrs. econ., 4 hrs. govt., 4 hrs. soc., 4 hrs. geog.; II-12 hrs. gen. hist., 12 hrs. US hist.; III-8 hrs. soc., 8 hrs. govt., 8 hrs. econ.	Minor--24 hrs; Majors--40 hrs. & 52 hrs. (not clear)	14 hrs. soc. & beh. sci. (gen. ed.); minor--24 hrs.; majors--40 & 52 hrs. (not clear)
Iowa	20 hrs. major & 15 hrs. minors in 2 fields; or 30 hrs. major & 20 hrs. minor	15 hrs. soc. st. incl. "some preparation in subject taught"	Hrs. not specified
Kansas	10 hrs. soc. sci., incl. hist. (gen. ed.); 24 hrs. soc. sci. (6 hrs. in each subj. taught)	10 hrs. soc. sci. (gen. ed.); 24 hrs. soc. sci. (min. 6 hrs. in each subj. taught)	12 hrs. hist. & soc. & beh. sci. (gen. ed.); 36 hrs. soc. sci., incl. 12 hrs. Am. hist., 12 hrs. govt. & 12 hrs. world hist.; 6 hrs. for each subj. taught--anthro., econ., soc., geog., "etc."

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Kentucky	2 Majors 24 hrs; or 1 major 24 hrs. & 2 minors 18 hrs. each; or 1 major & 1 minor totaling 48 hrs.	12 hrs. soc. sci., (gen. ed.); 12-18 hrs. "pre-professional preparation," incl. fdtns. of phil., psych., soc., & anthro.; 48 hrs. in soc.st., or 48 hrs. total in major & minor or in 2 majors or major & 2 minors	same as 1965-66
Louisiana	12 hrs. soc. st., which incls. hist., econ., soc., geog., pol. sci., & survey of soc. sci., & 3-6 hrs. must be in US hist. (gen. ed.); 12 hrs. soc. st., incl. 3 hrs. in govt.	same as 1955-56	gen. ed. same as 1955-56; 18 hrs. in soc. st., incl. 6 hrs. US hist., 3 hrs. state hist., 6 hrs. west. civ., or world hist., 3 hrs. soc.
Maine	Major--24 hrs.; Minor--15 hrs. or 2 minors 12 hrs. each	Major--30 hrs. & Minor--18 hrs; or specialization of 50 hrs.	same as 1965-66
Maryland	18 hrs. hist. (incl. Am. hist.) & 6 hrs. econ., soc., pol. sci. or geog.	24 hrs. hist., incl. 6 hrs. US hist.; or 24 hrs. geog.; or 36 hrs. soc. st., incl. 18 hrs. hist. (6 US hist.), 6 hrs. econ., & 12 hrs. soc., pol. sci., & geog.	24 hrs. hist, incl. 6 hrs. US hist.; or 24 hrs. geog.; or 36 hrs. soc. st., incl. 18 hrs. hist. (6 US hist.), 6 hrs. econ., & one course each in soc., pol. sci., & geog.
Massachusetts	Hrs. not specified	Major: 18 hrs. Minor: 9 hrs.	Major: 18 hrs.
Michigan	Major: 24 hrs. 2 minors: 15 hrs. each	same as 1955-56	Major: 30 hrs. Minor: 20 hrs.
Minnesota	Major: 24 hrs. Minor: 15 hrs.	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Mississippi	12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); 24 hrs. soc. st. (incl. 6 world hist.; 6 Am. hist.; 6 soc., econ., pol. sci., or geog.; and 6 electives)	12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); 30 soc. st. (incl. 6 world hist., 6 Am. hist., 3 econ. 3 govt., 3 geog., 3 state hist. 6 electives)	12 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); 45 soc. st. (incl. 6 world hist., 6 Am. hist., 6 econ., 6 govt., 3 geog., 3 state hist., 15 electives)
Missouri	5 hrs. Am. hist., 5 hrs. European hist., 2 hrs. Am. govt., 2 hrs. econ., 2 hrs. soc., 8 hrs. other soc. st.	5 hrs. Am. hist, 5 hrs. European or world hist., 5 hrs. US or state govt., 9 hrs. other soc. st.	40 hrs. soc. st.
Montana	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified	Major: 30 hrs.
Nebraska	15 hrs. each in 2 fields	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified
Nevada	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified	Major: 30 hrs. Minor: 16 hrs.
New Hampshire	Major: 18 hrs. (6 hrs. in each subj. taught)	Major: 30 hrs. Minor: 12 hrs. (6 hrs. in each subj. taught)	Major: 30 hrs.
New Jersey	18 hrs. in one field	same as 1955-56	Hrs. not specified
New Mexico	Major--24 hrs. & Minor--15 hrs; or 2 minors, 15 hrs. each.	2 majors, 24 hrs. each; or major 24 hrs. & 2 minors, 18 hrs. each; or composite field, 36 hrs. & minor, 18 hrs.	2 majors, 24 hrs. each; or major, 36 hrs. & minor, 24 hrs; or composite field, 54 hrs.
New York	30 hrs. soc. st.	6 hrs. Am. Hist.; 6 hrs. European hist.; & 24 hrs. in 4 of following: anthro., econ., geog., pol. sci., soc., hist. other than European & Am.	36 hrs. soc. st.

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
North Carolina	6 hrs. European or world hist.; 6 hrs. Am. hist.; 12 hrs. govt., geog., soc., or econ.; 6 hrs from any of preceding	21 hrs. Am. & world hist.; 21 hrs. anthro., econ., geog., pol. sci., & soc., with about equal hrs. in each	Hrs. not specified
North Dakota	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified
Ohio	15 hrs. hist., incl. west. civ., Am. hist., & pol. sci.; or 40 hrs. soc. st., incl. Am. hist., modern Europ. hist., econ., soc., pol. sci., & geog.	27 hrs. hist. & govt., incl. West. civ., Am. hist., & pol. sci.; or 45 hrs. soc. st., incl. Am. hist., West. civ., econ., soc., pol. sci., & geog.	soc. sci. (gen. ed.--hrs. not specified); 60 hrs. soc. st. or 20 hrs. geog or 30 hrs. hist. or 20 hrs. pol. sci. or 20 hrs. soc. psych. or 20 hrs. soc.
Oklahoma	30 hrs. soc. st. incl. "such fields as" hist., geog., soc., econ, anthro., & govt.	6 hrs. Am. hist., 2-3 geog, & state hist., (gen. ed.); 36 hrs. soc. st., incl. anthro., econ., geog., govt., hist., & soc.	6 hrs. Am. hist. & Am. govt., 2-3 hrs. geog. (gen. ed.); 18 hrs. soc. st.
Oregon	Hrs not specified	54 hrs soc. st.	54 q. hrs. soc. st. incl. 48 q. hrs. among Am. hist., world hist., geog., pol. sci., econ., soc., psych., & anthro.; and incl 6 q. hrs. urban studies, minority stuides, or environ. studies
Pennsylvania	18 hrs. soc. st., incl. 9 hrs. soc. sci. (econ., soc., govt.) & 9 hrs. hist; or 18 hrs. hist.	Major: 24 hrs.	Hrs. not specified
Rhode Island	30 hrs. soc. st.; or 15 hrs. soc. st. other than hist.; or 15 hrs. hist.	18 hrs. hist; 36 hrs. soc. st., incl. 18 hrs. hist.	same as 1965-66

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
South Carolina	12 hrs. soc. st., covering at least 3 fields (gen. ed.); 12-30 hrs. spec.	12 hrs. soc. st., with 6 hrs. each in 2 fields (gen. ed.); 12-30 hrs. spec.	gen. ed. same as 1965-66; 12-60 hrs. spec.
South Dakota	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified
Tennessee	8 hrs. soc. st. (gen. ed.); 36 hrs. soc. st. (incl. 6 hrs. Am. hist., 6 hrs. Europ. & world hist., 6 hrs. soc., 6 hrs. geog., 6 hrs. govt.) or 18 hrs. hist. (incl. 6 hrs. Am. & 6 hrs. Europ. or world)	same as 1955-56	same as 1955-56
Texas	2 hrs. Texas & Federal Constitutions or 6 hrs. Am. govt.	3 hrs. Fed. & Texas Constitutions; 6 hrs. Am. hist.	Same as 1965-66
Utah	10 q. hrs soc. sci. (gen. ed.); 60 q. hrs. composite major in 2 or more related subjs w/ min. 18 q. hrs in any one or 30 q. hrs. major & 18 q. hrs. minor	same as 1955-56	40 q. hrs. major & 22 q. hrs. minor; or 62 q. hrs. composite major if not less than 2 field.
Vermont	Major: 24 hrs. Minor: 12 hrs.	30 hrs. hist. or 48 hrs. soc. st. incl. 18 hrs. hist.	Hrs. not specified

STATE	1955-56	1965-66	1975-76
Virginia	12 hrs. soc. st. incl. US hist. (gen. ed.); 12 hrs. geog. or 12 hrs. govt. or 18 hrs. hist. or 18 hrs. from 3 (govt., econ. geog, soc., intro to soc. st., inat'l relats.) or 12 hrs. hist. & 12 hrs. of those listed in parentheses or 18 hrs. in 2 or more (Am. hist., English hist., Europ. hist., world hist., ancient hist.)	12 hrs. soc. sci. incl. US hist. (gen. ed.); 12 hrs. geog. or 12 hrs. govt. or 18 hrs. hist. or 15 hrs. soc. sci. & 15 hrs. hist. (incl. 2: Am. hist., English hist., Europ. hist., world hist., ancient hist.)	12 hrs. soc. sci. incl. Am. hist., other hist, anthro., soc., econ., pol. sci., geog., & psych (gen. ed.); 18 hrs. geog. or 18 hrs. govt. or 24 hrs. hist., or 18 hrs. hist. & 12 hrs. govt. & 6 hrs. geog. & 6 hrs. econ. or 18 hrs. econ. or 18 hrs. soc.
Washington	Major: 20 hrs.; Minor: 10 hrs; 10 hrs. contemp. soc. probs. (current hist., pol. sci., econ., soc.)	Hrs. not specified	Hrs. not specified
West Virginia	6 hrs. devel. of soc. instits & 6 hrs. fund. soc. probs. (gen. ed.); 24 hrs. soc. sci.	same as 1955-56	soc. st. (gen. ed., hrs not specified); 48 hrs. soc. st.
Wisconsin	24 hrs. major & 2 15-hrs. minors; or 2 24 hrs. majors; course in conservation of natural resources & course in cooperative marketing & consumers' cooperatives	34 hrs. major & 22 hrs. minor or 2 34 hrs. major; 2 special courses same as 1955-56	34 hr. major or 22 hr. minor; special courses same as 1955-56
Wyoming	soc. st. (gen. ed.--hrs. not specified); 15 hrs. in each teaching field	gen. ed. same as 1955-56; 30 hrs. soc. st.	soc. sci. (gen. ed.--hrs not specified); 36 hrs. soc. st.

Notes to tables A-6 and A-7

1. When a state offered several levels of certification (e.g., temporary, provisional, standard, master teacher), we used the one that appeared to be the standard level with a bachelor's degree as a basic requirement. This was not always the minimum, however, since a few states do allow teaching with less than a bachelor's degree.
2. Hrs. = semester hours; q. hrs. = quarter hours of colelge course credit
3. Other abbreviations:

   NA = not applicable
   soc. st. = social studies
   soc. sci. = social science
   incl. = including
   hist. = history (Am. = American)
   govt. = government
   civ. = civilization(s)
   econ. = economics
   pol. sci. = political science
   soc. = sociology or social
   geog. = geography
   anthro. = anthropology
   beh. sci. = behavioral science(s)
   phil. - philosophy
   certif. = certification
   biol. = biology
   contemp. = contemporary
   probs. = problems
   relig. = religion
   psych. = psychology
   instits. = institutions
   gen. ed. = general education (required of all, not just soc. st. majors)
   subj. = subject
   fdtns. = foundations
   inatl. = international
   relats. = relations
   environ. = environmental
   min. = minimum
   devel. = development
   instits. = institutions
   fund. = fundamental
4. When requirements for junior and senior high were different, used senior high requirements only.
5. In a number of cases, requirements for secondary level stated only that a bachelor's degree or a major field meeting an accredited university's requirements (or some similar condition) was necessary for certification, without specifying the exact number of credit hours in major and/or minor fields. In these cases, we have noted "hrs. not specified." This does not mean one can be certified to teach social studies without ever having had a college course in the field, however. At the elementary level, on the

other hand, it appears that in a number of cases one need never have taken a social studies course in college to be eligible for certification; hence, we have used "0" in these cases in the elementary chart.

6. A number of the specifications given in the sources for this chart were not at all clear and we have had to guess sometimes, as a consequence. A very frequent source of fuzziness was whether required general education credits in social studies could be counted as part of a major or minor in the social studies area or had to be earned in addition to the courses taken toward a major or minor. If it was clearly indicated that the general education social studies hours could be included within the hours for a social studies major, we did not list the general education requirements; otherwise we listed the general education requirements in addition to the major and minor requirements.

Sources

Woellner, Robert C., and M. Aurilla Wood. 1955-56. Requirements for Certification of Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges, 20th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Woellner, Elizabeth H., and M. Aurilla Wood. 1965-66. Requirements for Certification: Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges, 30th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Woellner, Elizabeth H. 1975-76. Requirements for Certification: Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges, 40th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Table A-8

Complete Listing of NAEP Knowledge Area Exercises

Exercise #	Exercise Description	Nat'l Level of Acceptable Performance (Percent)			
		Age 9	Age 13	Age 17	Adult
A. Economics					
	1. Understands some of the basic characteristics of economic systems that are common to all industrial societies.				
RKE01	Recognition of sales tax	83	--	--	--
RKE02	The relation of wages to prices	44	--	--	--
UKE03	Retail profit/Unreleased	49	--	--	--
RKE04	Understanding credit purchases	89	--	--	--
UKE05	Government role in the economic process/Unreleased	--	47	58	75
UKE06	Production of goods and services/Unreleased	--	65	81	77
RKE07	Difference between producer and consumer goods	--	57	81	79
UKE08	Utilization of disposable income/Unreleased	--	80	87	93
UKE09A	Industrial society/Unreleased	--	66	60	52
RKE09B	Industrial society/Individual craftsmanship	--	41	66	53
RKE09C	Industrial society/Rural to urban	--	67	78	83
UKE09D	Industrial society/Unreleased	--	20	30	28
UKE10	Industrial society/Unreleased	--	27	55	50
UKE11	Goods and services/Unreleased	--	--	26	28
RKE12	The meaning of monopoly	--	--	51	56
RKE13	The market system/Farm prices seek their own level	--	--	21	30
RKE14	The purpose of the Common Market	--	22	45	55
RKE15A	US and USSR similarities and differences/Natural resources	--	54	72	72
UKE15B	US and USSR similarities and differences/Unreleased	--	35	60	72
UKE15C	US and USSR similarities and differences/Unreleased	--	34	22	21
RKE15D	US and USSR similarities and differences/Government ownership and control	--	54	79	72
RKE16	Big business' effect on foreign nation	--	--	52	52

Exercise #	Exercise Description	Nat'l Level of Acceptabl Performance (Percent)			
		Age 9	Age 13	Age 17	Adul

B. Geography

1. Has knowledge of worldwide spatial distribution and interrelationship of the major features of man's physical and cultural environment.

Exercise #	Exercise Description	Age 9	Age 13	Age 17	Adul
RKG01	Location of Great Lakes	51	--	--	--
RKG02A	Location of major river/Amazon	57	--	--	--
RKG02B	Location of major river/Mississippi	80	--	--	--
UKG02C	Location of major river/Unreleased	61	--	--	--
RKG02D	Location of major river/Ohio	68	--	--	--
UKG02E	Location of major river/Unreleased	61	--	--	--
UKG03	Location of major city/Unreleased	72	--	--	--
RKG04	State bordering Pacific Ocean/California	43	--	--	--
RKG05	State bordering Atlantic Ocean/New York	37	--	--	--
UKG06	Regional location of a state/Unreleased	37	--	--	--
UKG07	Regional location of a state/Unreleased	40	--	--	--
RSO01	Man from Peru	70	--	--	--
USO04	Shows interest in people with cultural differences/Ceylon pen pal	67	82	--	--
USO02	Shows interest in people with cultural differences/Girl traveler	79	--	--	--
RKG08	Importance of water routes/Columbus	24	71	--	--
RKG09	Latitude and longitude/Climate	--	30	34	22
USI27	Outline map and table/Unreleased	--	23	37	33
RSI26	Latitude and longitude/Place location	--	24	34	34
RKE15A	US and USSR similarities and differences/Natural resources	--	54	72	72
RKG10	Geographic determinism/Camel use on desert	89	--	--	--
UKG11	Geographic determinism/Unreleased	81	--	--	--
UKG12	Climate/Unreleased	22	54	--	--
UKG13	Language/Unreleased	--	58	78	66
RKG14	Map of rainfall zones	--	53	60	47
RKG15	Population determinant/Low birth and death rates	--	--	19	30
UKG16	Social status determinant/Unreleased	--	--	44	45

Exercise #	Exercise Description	Nat'l Level of Acceptable Performance (Percent)			
		Age 9	Age 13	Age 17	Adult
RKG17	Adaption to desert life	40	60	71	77
RKG18	Effects of environmental modification/Highway construction	47	75	82	85
UKG19	Interrelationship of cultural and physical environment/Unreleased	--	--	46	39
RKG20	Interrelationship of cultural and physical environment/Tribalism and nationalism in Africa	--	--	30	37
C. History					
	1. Understands some of the major developments in United States history.				
RKH01	Greatest influence on US/England	40	67	79	77
UKH02	Major US holiday/Unreleased	94	--	--	--
UKH03	Major US holiday/Unreleased	69	--	--	--
UKH04	American Revolution/Unreleased	--	46	--	--
RKH05	American Revolution/Independence from England	45	--	--	--
RKH06	American Revolution/One reason	--	50	64	49
USI20A	Declaration of Independence/Unreleased	--	93	95	96
USI20B	Declaration of Independence/Unreleased	--	69	67	64
RSI20C	Declaration of Independence/Inalienable rights	--	75	80	78
RSI20D	Declaration of Independence/Right to govern from people	--	80	90	94
RKH07	Declaration of Independence/Main purpose	--	77	85	79
RKH08	First president of the US	83	--	--	--
UKH09	Famous president/Unreleased	--	61	82	76
UKE10	Industrial society/Unreleased	--	27	55	50
RKH10	Direct cause of WWII/Pearl Harbor	--	--	89	87
UKH11	The regulation of big business/Unreleased	--	--	39	36
UKH12	Civil rights/Unreleased	--	--	32	49
RSO07	Three problems of large cities	--	38	59	66
RKH13A	Minority roles in the history and culture of America/American Indians, at least 2 names	6	18	35	41

Exercise #	Exercise Description	Nat'l Level of Acceptable Performance (Percent)			
		Age 9	Age 13	Age 17	Adult
RKH13B	Minority roles in the history and culture of America/Black Americans, at least 3 names	8	34	64	73
RKH13C	Minority roles in the history and culture of America/Oriental Americans, at least 2 names	0	0	1	4
RKH13D	Minority roles in the history and culture of America/Spanish-speaking Americans, at least 2 names	1	3	7	20
	2. Understands some of the major developments in world history.				
RKG08	Importance of water routes/Columbus	24	71	--	--
UKH14A	Sense of historical time/Unreleased	58	63	55	63
UKH14B	Sense of historical time/Unreleased	91	98	99	98
RKH14C	Sense of historical time/Printing press	49	57	54	61
RKH14D	Sense of historical time/Travel 50 mph	83	87	85	91
RKH15A	Sense of historical time/Telegraph	79	97	98	96
UKH15B	Sense of historical time/Unreleased	20	35	46	39
RKH15C	Sense of historical time/Compass	63	75	75	66
UKH15D	Sense of historical time/Unreleased	86	96	96	93
UKH16	Greatest influence on culture of foreign country/Unreleased	40	65	85	81
UKE09A	Industrial society/Unreleased	--	66	60	52
RKE09B	Industrial society/Individual craftsmanship	--	41	66	53
RKE09C	Industrial society/Rural to urban	--	67	78	83
UKE09D	Industrial society/Unreleased	--	20	30	28
RKG15	Population determinant/Low birth and death rates	--	--	19	30
RKE15A	US and USSR similarities and differences/Natural resources	--	54	72	72
UKE15B	US and USSR similarities and differences/Unreleased	--	35	60	72
UKE15C	US and USSR similarities and differences/Unreleased	--	34	22	21
RKE15D	US and USSR similarities and differences/Government ownership and control	--	54	79	72
RKH17	Organization for world peace/UN	--	67	70	81
RKH18	Major goal of UN/Peace	47	77	92	89

Exercise #	Exercise Description	Nat'l Level of Acceptable Performance (Percent)			
		Age 9	Age 13	Age 17	Adult
UKH19	Relationship of major powers/Unreleased	--	--	50	62
RKE14	Purpose of the Common Market	--	22	45	55
UKG19	Cultural effects on physical environment/Unreleased	--	--	46	39
RKG20	Cultural effects on physical environment/Tribalism and nationalism in Africa	--	--	30	37
RKE16	Big business' effect on foreign nation	--	--	52	52

D. Political science

1. Knows some of the individuals and groups responsible for making government decisions.

RKP01	The duties of the Health Department/Inspection	36	--	--	--
RKP02	Responsibility for a fair trial/Judge	74	--	--	--
RKP03	Head of town government/Mayor	58	--	--	--
RKP04	Academic most interested in government/Political scientist	--	50	72	74
UKP05	Cabinet position/Unreleased	--	39	67	66
UKP06	Foreign affairs/Unreleased	--	27	38	64
UKP07A	Government responsibility/Local	--	67	83	89
UKP07B	Government responsibility/State	--	47	65	70
UKP07C	Government responsibility/State	--	60	87	89
UKP07D	Government responsibility/Federal	--	83	94	96
RKP08A	Establish central branch of university/State	--	71	84	79
RKP08B	Raise mail rates/Federal	--	72	90	95
RKP08C	Lower tax on imports/Federal	--	73	89	92
RKP08D	Increase garbage collection/Local	--	77	92	92

2. Understands some of the rights and responsibilities granted in the Constitution.

RKP09	Statement of civil rights/Constitution	--	63	84	78

Exercise #	Exercise Description	Nat'l Level of Acceptable Performance (Percent)			
		Age 9	Age 13	Age 17	Adult
UKP10	Basic constitutional rights/Unreleased	--	77	--	--
UKP12	International relations/Unreleased	--	26	49	46
RKP11	Supreme Court/Prayer in school decision	--	--	49	52
RKP13	Supreme Court/Power to declare act of Congress unconstitutional	--	35	71	62
UKP14	Supreme Court/Unreleased	--	--	9	--
UKP15	Supreme Court/Unreleased	--	30	56	66
	3. Knows something about the election process and the role of political parties.				
RKP16	Elected and appointed officials/Senators	--	74	89	90
RKP17	The nomination of presidential candidates/National Convention	--	17	49	60
RKP18A-E	Using a simple ballot/All five parts	--	--	41	44
RS006A	Evaluating politicians/Where to get information	--	42	62	69
US006B	Evaluating politicians/Raising appropriate questions	--	70	75	76
	4. Understands some of the processes involved in political socialization.				
RKP19	Cooperation in social situations	92	--	--	--
UKP20	Cooperation in school	97	--	--	--
RKP21	Why society has rules and regulations	--	67	84	69

Table A-9

STATE STUDENT TESTING PROGRAMS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE/SOCIAL STUDIES AND CITIZENSHIP, 1973*

	Social Science/ Social Studies	Citizenship
Alabama		X
Alaska		
Arizona		P
Arkansas	X	
California		
Canal Zone		
Colorado	X	X
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida	X	
Georgia		
Guam		
Hawaii	X	
Idaho	X	
Illinois	X	P
Indiana	P	P
Iowa	X	
Kansas	X	P
Kentucky		X
Louisiana	P	P
Maine	P	X
Maryland		
Massachusetts		X
Michigan		
Minnesota	P	P
Mississippi		
Missouri	P	P
Montana		P
Nebraska	X	
Nevada		
New Hampshire	X	

New Jersey		
New Mexico	X	
New York	X	
North Carolina		
North Dakota	X	
Ohio	P	P
Oklahoma		
Oregon	P	
Pennsylvania		X
Puerto Rico	X	
Rhode Island		
South Carolina	X	P
South Dakota	X	X
Tennessee	X	
Texas		
Utah	X	
Vermont		
Virginia	X	
Virgin Islands	X	
Washington		
West Virginia	X	
Wisconsin		
Wyoming	P	P
Total	X=21 P= 8	X= 7 P=11

X = testing program already administered or in progress as of 1973

P = testing program planned or being considered for some time after 1973

* The above information was extracted from two sources:

State Testing Programs: 1973 Revision. 1973. Princeton, NJ: ERIC Clearinghouse for Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation. ED 087 789

State Educational Assessment Programs: 1973 Revision. 1973. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service; and Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. ED 080 582.

Table A-10

REPORTS OF STATE STUDENT TESTING PROGRAMS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE/SOCIAL STUDIES AND CITIZENSHIP AVAILABLE THROUGH ERIC AS OF SPRING 1977

Colorado	Helper, John W. 1972. An Assessment of Learner Needs in Colorado, School Year 1970-1971. Denver, Co: Colorado State Department of Education. ED 068 514.
Delaware	Handrick, Fannie A. 1975. Delaware Educational Assessment Program 1974-75. Report of the Spring 1975 Testing Program. Dover, DE: Delaware State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation. ED 118 608.
Hawaii	Loui, Beatrice. 1972. Summary Report of Minimum Testing Program 1970-1971. Evaluation Report No. 80. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii State Department of Education, Office of Instruction Services. ED 079 408.
Maine	Maine Assessment of Educational Progress, Report 2. Results Report 1: Citizenship and Writing, 1972. 1972. Augusta, ME: Maine State Department of Educational and Cultural Services, Research Consortium for Educational Assessment. ED 080 598.
Massachusetts	Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program: Citizenship and Social Studies, 1975-1976. 1976. Boston, MA: State Department of Education, Bureau of Research and Assessment. SO 009 908.
New Mexico	Analysis of Standardized Testing Program Results 1973-74: Grades 1, 5, and 8 and ACT Report. 1974. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education, Evaluation, Assessment, and Testing Unit. ED 098 264.
	Analysis of Standardized Testing Program Results 1972-73: Grades 1, 5, and 8 and ACT Report. 1973. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education. ED 079 241.
North Carolina	Social Studies. Grade 3. State Assessment of Educational Progress in North Carolina, 1973-74. 1975. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Research. ED 108 988.
South Carolina	Johnson, Lynne M., and John M. Finch. 1976. South Carolina Statewide Testing Program, Fall, 1975: General Report. Columbia, SC: South Carolina State Department of Education, Office of Research. ED 121 847.

Table A-11

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SOCIAL STUDIES ACHIEVEMENT AND TEACHER RATINGS ON SOCIAL STUDIES ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

Objective	Percent of Teachers Reporting							Percent of Students Correctly Responding To Item(s)
	Objective Important			Objective Being Taught In Their Classroom	Objective Generally Being Taught In Their School District	Item(s) Either Good Or Adequate Measure Of Objective	That Two Thirds of Their Students Would Respond Correctly To Item(s)	
	Very Imp.	Somewhat Imp.	Total					
INFORMATION PROCESSING	85	15	100	100	93	91	57	65
Identify Source of Information	73	27	100	98	95	100	73	93
Identify several sources	50	40	90	70	60	88	46	76
Infer Types of Neighborhood and Geographic Conditions	75	25	100	100	88	97	85	96
Sequence of Events	88	10	98	98	92	83	44	46
Chronological Order	45	45	90	83	65	92	47	64
Cardinal Directions	80	18	98	93	90	91	43	48
Land and Water Masses	93	5	98	98	98	85	50	50
Locate Country and State	98	2	100	100	93	93	64	45
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	78	15	93	93	88	88	45	53
Effect of Physical Environment	82	18	100	100	88	96	60	70
Adapting to Physical Environment	53	43	96	80	66	91	61	65
Geographic Conditions and Industrial Development	48	48	96	98	65	88	45	57
No Contact Between Communities	53	38	91	75	60	73	19	31
Interdependence	83	15	98	95	78	90	39	40

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SOCIAL STUDIES ACHIEVEMENT AND TEACHER
RATINGS ON SOCIAL STUDIES ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES (CONTINUED)

Objective	Percent of Teachers Reporting							Percent of Students Correctly Responding To Item(s)
	Objective Important			Objective Being Taught In Their Classroom	Objective Generally Being Taught In Their School District	Item(s) Either Good Or Adequate Measure of Objective	That Two Thirds of Their Students Would Respond Correctly To Item(s)	
	Very Imp.	Somewhat Imp.	Total					
CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT	73	27	100	100	88	88	45	59
Heredity vs. Environment	50	40	90	75	63	90	71	59
CULTURAL UNIVERSALS	53	43	96	93	60	96	73	72
Requirements for Survival	93	5	98	93	95	96	76	73
Laws for Different Cultures	33	40	73	58	51	93	61	58
Specific Changes and Their Effects	50	45	95	88	61	99	81	84
ECONOMIC SYSTEM	70	28	98	98	84	88	49	69
Identify Consumers and Producers	58	42	100	98	90	84	40	61
Producers of Goods and Services	50	48	98	88	75	89	47	67
Factors Affecting Values of Goods	40	50	90	70	63	92	59	79
POLITICAL SYSTEM	85	13	98	98	89	94	64	62
Purposes of Government	83	15	98	95	78	97	77	81
Services Provided by Government	68	28	96	95	78	95	56	65
Elected Offices in Government	65	30	95	90	73	95	63	68
Identify Governor and President	100	0	100	100	98	98	85	76
Process of Election	70	28	98	89	75	86	37	20

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SOCIAL STUDIES ACHIEVEMENT AND TEACHER RATINGS ON SOCIAL STUDIES ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES (CONTINUED)

Objective	Percent of Teachers Reporting							Percent of Students Correctly Responding To Item(s)
	Objective Important			Objective Being Taught In Their Classroom	Objective Generally Being Taught In Their School District	Item(s) Either Good Or Adequate Measure of Objective	That Two Thirds of Their Students Would Respond Correctly To Item(s)	
	Very Imp.	Somewhat Imp.	Total					
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	43	38	81	68	58	96	53	53
Resolving International Conflicts	50	38	88	60	50	96	53	53
ACTING FOR THE GENERAL INTEREST	83	15	98	95	78	91	71	86
Purpose of Law Enforcement	83	17	100	93	76	91	71	86

Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines

Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines

1.0 The Social Studies Program Should Be Directly Related to the Concerns of Students.

1.1 Students should be involved in the formulation of goals, the selection of activities and instructional strategies, and the assessment of curricular outcomes.

1.2 The school and its teachers should make steady efforts, through regularized channels and practices, to identify areas of concern to students.

1.3 Students should have some choices, some options within programs fitted to their needs, their concerns, and their social world.

1.4 All students should have ample opportunity for social studies education at all grade levels, from K-12.

2.0 The Social Studies Program Should Deal with the Real Social World.

2.1 The program should focus on the social world as it is, its flaws, its ideals, its strengths, its dangers, and its promise.

2.2 The program should emphasize pervasive and enduring social issues.

2.3 The program should include analysis and attempts to formulate potential resolutions of present and controversial problems such as racism, poverty, war, and population.

2.4 The program should provide intensive and recurrent study of cultural, racial, religious, and ethnic groups, those to which students themselves belong and those to which they do not.

2.5 The program should offer opportunities for students to meet discuss, study, and work with members of racial and ethnic groups other then their own.

2.6 The program should build upon the realities of the immediate school community.

2.7 Participation in the real social world both in school and out should be considered a part of the social studies program.

3.0 The Social Studies Program Should Draw from Currently Valid Knowledge Representative of Man's Experience, Culture, and Beliefs.

3.1 The program should emphasize currently valid concepts, principles, and theories in the social sceinces.

3.2 The program should develop proficiency in methods of inquiry in the social sciences and in techniques for processing social data.

3.3 The program should develop students' ability to distinguish among empirical, logical, definitional, and normative propositions and problems.

3.4 The program should draw upon all of the social sciences such as anthropology, economics, geography, political science, sociology, the history of the United States, and the history of the Western and non-Western worlds.

3.5 The program should draw from what is appropriate in other related fields such as psychology, law, communications, and the humanities.

3.6 The program should represent some balance between the immediate social environment of students and the larger social world; between small group and public issues; among local, national, and world affairs; among past, present, and future directions; and among Western and non-Western cultures.

3.7 The program should include the study not only of man's achievements, but also of those events and policies which are commonly considered contrary to present national goals, for example, slavery and imperialism.

3.8 The program must include a careful selection from the disciplines of that knowledge which is of most worth.

4.0 Objectives Should Be Thoughtfully Selected and Clearly Stated in Such Form as to Furnish Direction to the Program.

4.1 Objectives should be carefully selected and formulated in the light of what is known about the students, their community, the real social world, and the fields of knowledge.

4.2 Knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation should all be represented in the stated objectives of social studies programs.

4.3 General statements of basic and long-range goals should be translated into more specific objectives conceived in terms of behavior and content.

4.4 Classroom instruction should rely upon statements which identify clearly what students are to learn; learning activities and instructional materials should be appropriate for achieving the stated objectives.

4.5 Classroom instruction should enable students to see their goals clearly in what is to be learned, whether in brief instructional sequences or lengthy units of study.

4.6 Objectives should be reconsidered and revised periodically.

5.0 Learning Activities Should Engage the Student Directly and Actively in the Learning Process.

5.1 Students should have a wide and rich range of learning activities appropriate to the objectives of their social studies program.

5.2 Activities should include formulating hypotheses and testing them by gathering and analyzing data.

5.3 Activities should include using knowledge, examining values, communicating with others, and making decisions about social and civic affairs.

5.4 Activities should include those which involve students in the real world of their communities.

5.5 Learning activities should be sufficiently varied and flexible to appeal to many kinds of students.

5.6 Activities should contribute to the students' perception of teachers as fellow inquirers.

5.7 Activities must be carried on in a climate which supports students' self-respect and opens opportunities to all.

6.0 Strategies of Instruction and Learning Activities Should Rely on a Broad Range of Learning Resources.

6.1 A social studies program requires a great wealth of appropriate instructional resources; no one textbook can be sufficient.

6.2 Printed materials must accommodate a wide range of reading abilities and interests, meet the requirements of learning activities, and include many sorts of material from primary as well as secondary sources, from social science and history as well as the humanities and related fields, from current as well as basic sources.

6.3 A variety of media should be available for learning through seeing, hearing, touching, and acting, and calling for thought and feeling.

6.4 Social studies classrooms should draw upon the potential contributions of many kinds of resource persons and organizations representing many points of view and a variety of abilities.

6.5 Classroom activities should use the school and community as a learning laboratory for gathering social data and for confronting knowledge and commitments in dealing with social problems.

6.6 The social studies program should have available many kinds of work space to facilitate variation in the size of groups, the use of several kinds of media, and a diversity of tasks.

7.0 The Social Studies Program Must Facilitate the Organization of Experience.

7.1 Structure in the social studies program must help students organize their experiences to promote growth.

7.2 Learning experiences should be organized in such fashion that students will learn how to continue to learn.

7.3 The program must enable students to relate their experiences in social studies to other areas of experience.

7.4 The formal pattern of the program should offer choice and flexibility.

8.0 Evaluation Should Be Useful, Systematic, Comprehensive, and Valid for the Objectives of the Program.

8.1 Evaluation should be based primarily on the school's own statements of objectives as the criteria for effectiveness.

8.2 Included in the evaluation process should be assessment of progress not only in knowledge, but in skills and abilities including thinking, the process of valuing, and social participation--all the components of social studies education.

8.3 Evaluation data should come from many sources, not merely from paper-and-pencil tests, including observations of what students do outside as well as inside the classroom.

8.4 Regular, comprehensive, and continuous procedures should be developed for gathering evidence of significant growth in learning over time.

8.5 Evaluation data should be used for planning curricular improvement.

8.6 Evaluation data should offer students and teachers help in the course of learning and not merely at the conclusion of some marking period.

8.7 Both students and teachers should be involved in the process of evaluation.

8.8 Thoughtful and regular re-examination of the basic goals of the social studies curriculum should be an integral part of the evaluation program.

9.0 Social Studies Education Should Receive Vigorous Support as a Vital and Responsible Part of the School Program.

9.1 Appropriate instructional materials, time, and facilities must be provided for social studies education.

9.2 Teachers should be responsible for trying out and adapting for their own students promising innovations such as simulation, newer curricular plans, discovery, and actual social participation.

9.3 Decisions about the basic purpose of social studies education in any school should be as clearly related to the needs of its immediate community as to those of society at large.

9.4 Teachers should participate in active social studies curriculum committees with decision-making as well as advisory responsibilities.

9.5 Teachers should participate regularly in activities which foster their professional competence in social studies education: in workshops, or in-service classes, or community affairs, or in reading, study, and travel.

9.6 Teachers and others concerned with social studies education in the schools should have consultants with competence in social studies available for help.

9.7 Teachers and schools should have and be able to rely upon a district-wide policy statement on academic freedom and professional responsibility.

Recommendations of the American Economic Association's National Task Force on Economic Education, 1961

Recommendations of the American Economic Association's National Task Force on Economic Education, 1961

(from Economic Education in the Schools: Report of the National Task Force on Economic Education, chapter 4. New York, NY: Committee on Economic Development, 1961.)

1. We recommend that more time be devoted in high school curricula to the development of economic understanding.
2. We recommend that wherever feasible students take a high school course in economics or its equivalent under another title (such as Problems of American Democracy); and that in all high schools of substantial size there be at least an elective senior-year course in economics.
3. We recommend that courses in problems of American democracy (now taken by perhaps half of all high school students) devote a substantial portion of their time to development of economic understanding of the kind outlined in [this report].
4. We recommend that more economic analysis be included in history courses.
5. We recommend that all business education curricula include a required course in economics.
6. We recommend that economic understanding be emphasized at several other points in the entire school curriculum.
7. We recommend central emphasis on the rational way of thinking . . . as a prime objective of the teaching of economics.
8. We recommend that examination of controversial issues be included, where appropriate, in teaching economics.
9. To improve the ability of teachers, we recommend several steps.
    (a) We recommend that teacher certification requirements in all states require a minimum of one full year (6 unit) course in college economics for all social studies and business education teachers.

(b) We recommend that school boards and administrators consider these certification standards as minimum requirements, and they take steps to enforce higher standards wherever feasible.

(c) To help present teachers improve their economic competence, we recommend increased use of summer workshops, teacher participation in a nationwide television economics course planned for 1962-63, and return to college for additional work in economics.

(d) We recommend that colleges preparing teachers improve the economics courses offered for this purpose, and establish other opportunities for high school teachers to increase their economic understanding.

10. We emphasize the need for more effective high school teaching materials and recommend that steps be taken by private publishers, foundations, and others to increase the supply of such materials.

11. We recommend that professional economists play a more active part in helping to raise the level of economics in the schools.

12. We urge widespread public support, both private and governmental, for the improvement of economics in the schools.

Conference Participant Recommendations for Precollege Economic Education, 1977

(from Donald R. Wentworth, W. Lee Hansen, and Sharryl H. Hawke, *Perspectives on Economic Education*, Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, Joint Council on Economic Education, and National Council for the Social Studies, 1977)

Conference Participant Recommendations for Precollege Economic Education

The National Conference on Needed Research and Development in Precollege Economic Education addressed two major questions:

> Is there sufficient and adequate research information available to guide precollege economic education development? If not, what areas should be investigated more completely?
>
> Is there sufficient and adequate curriculum material available to meet the needs of precollege economic education? If not, what type should be developed?

The general conclusion of the conference was that precollege economic education could benefit from increased research and development efforts. At present the field is developing a base of useful research information and curriculum materials, but much more work needs to be done. Current efforts are fragmentary, uncoordinated, and suffer from a lack of resources in all development and research areas. These problems could be lessened if major efforts were undertaken to improve precollege economic education.

Throughout the conference, presentors of major papers, respondents, and discussion group participants made recommendations for improving economic education at the precollege level. In Part I we summarized what we as conference directors felt were the six major recommendations emerging from the conference. In this section we present a more detailed listing of the scores of recommendations from which our six summary recommendations were drawn. While the following list may not include every suggestion put forward during the conference, it represents the most comprehensive list we were able to reconstruct. Recommendations are organized under the broad categories of "research" and "program development."

RESEARCH

Economic Literacy and Knowledge

1. Economic literacy should be clearly defined in an operational, criterion-referenced manner.
2. Factors that contribute to or correlate with low levels of economic understanding should be investigated. Among these factors are home environment, neighborhood, parental knowledge, school curricula, reading level, IQ, personal interest, socioeconomic status, writing ability, and general literacy.
3. The role which economic education can play in strengthening basic educational skills like reading and writing should be investigated.

Measures of Economic Literacy

4. Measures of economic understanding are needed at all grade levels. Those that exist should be updated and improved.
5. Investigators must develop programs to determine long-range impacts of economic education programs. These should give close attention to student attitudes, content knowledge, ethics, and skills.
6. National assessment tests should include more economic content so these tests can be used to measure the impact of economic education programs.
7. National norming information should be collected on standardized tests with breakdowns by age, sex, academic ability, reading levels, socioeconomic background, and geographic area.

How Children Learn

8. Research should be undertaken to explore what forces influence the development of children's economic images. How does social interaction with family, school, peer groups, work groups, and exposure to mass media correlate with the development of an individual's beliefs, attitudes, images, and values about the economy?
9. Research should be conducted to find out how children learn about economic behavior.
10. Research efforts should investigate how economic concepts can be presented to coincide with children's stages of cognitive development. All new curriculum projects should make a more realistic appraisal of children's levels of conceptualization.
11. Research efforts should seek to determine at what age level particular economic concepts can be learned with optimal efficiency.

Demand for Economic Education Materials

12. Surveys should be conducted to measure the relative interest of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and school boards in having a strong economic education component in school curricula.

13. Surveys should be conducted to find out the extent to which economics is now being taught at all precollege levels.

14. Curriculum decision makers should be surveyed to determine the most important reasons for adoption decisions on economic education materials.

15. The opportunity costs for schools installing economic education programs should be identified. What, if anything, must be given up to include economic education in the curriculum?

16. Surveys of school and community environment should be conducted to find out why currently available economic education materials are not being used. These might include factors such as teacher unionism, dropping student enrollments, and lower teacher mobility and turnover.

Teacher Preparation and Knowledge

17. The economic background and education of teachers should be surveyed.

18. Research exploring the socialization of teachers should be conducted to determine what training experiences result in high professional commitment to teaching economics.

19. Research should be conducted to investigate the influence of teachers' knowledge of economics on student understanding of the subject.

Program Assessment and Evaluation

20. Economic educators should design careful evaluation procedures as an important part of any curriculum project.

21. Any statistical analysis of research data should use the multiple linear regression analysis form unless substantial justification exists for a departure from the regression model.

22. A variety of evaluation instruments such as observation techniques, essay instruments, and responses to incomplete statements, should be used to complement written tests for evaluating student performance in economic education curriculum programs.

23. Instruments to measure different educational objectives should be included in new curricular projects. These instruments should diagnose, record on-going performance, and provide feedback to learners in addition to measuring end-of-program achievement.

24. A precollege economic education test bank should be developed.

25. Cost-benefit analyses should be conducted to test the impact of different approaches, methods, and materials used to teach economic education.

26. Research should be conducted to measure presently untested variables such as the impact of effort intensity (quantity and quality of student and teacher action in the learning process).

27. Ongoing evaluations of K-12 social studies materials, secondary economics textbooks, and business education materials should be made to determine the strengths and weaknesses of these materials.

Miscellaneous

28. Greater incentives (professional, personal, and monetary) should be given economic education researchers.

29. Researchers should investigate sex and ethnic bias in economic education tests, materials, and teaching strategies.

30. Researchers should investigate the cumulative experience of students in applying economic analysis.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Curriculum Development and Evaluation

31. Serious consideration should be given to developing a national model economic curriculum which could be adapted to meet local needs.

32. A series of modest curriculum projects should be undertaken in the next few years. Among the content areas which have not been given sufficient attention and could be profitably included in new curriculum are the following:

    a. Analysis of patterns of and reasons for U.S. income distribution.

    b. Analysis of assumptions and values underlying the U.S. economic system.

    c. Analysis of third world economics vis-à-vis developed economies.

    d. Problems related to economic discrimination against women and ethnic groups.

    e. Problems related to economic power of large institutions such as labor unions, large firms, conglomerates, and multinationals.

    f. Problems related to the role of regulatory agencies.

   g. Analysis of other economic systems.

   h. Problems and controversy within economics about current policy issues such as inflation and unemployment.

   i. Problems related to the power or lack of power of the individual actions operating in the economy.

33. Materials should be developed that are appropriate for 12- to 15-year-old students, since little economic education material is available for this age group.

34. New curriculum developments in economic education should:

   a. Be interdisciplinary.

   b. Involve multiethnic characteristics.

   c. Deal with ethical dimensions or inquiry into values.

   d. Complement general citizenship goals of education.

35. Great value should be given to the crucial role of varied educational experiences in building a sufficiently elaborate image of concepts and generalizations to enable individuals to effectively participate in economic decision making.

36. Pedagogical characteristics of senior high school materials should be improved by:

   a. Developing and testing audiovisual materials that can be used flexibly in a variety of learning situations.

   b. Developing and testing simulations that are less complex than those currently available.

   c. Developing and testing short curriculum units, perhaps dealing with current economic problems, which actively engage students in the learning process.

37. More attention should be given to individualized learning activities in newly developed curriculum materials.

38. New programs should be developed to involve gifted students in activities requiring them to identify hypotheses and empirically test them.

39. Materials need to be developed with reading levels appropriate to the children who will use them.

40. New economic education materials should be designed to integrate economic content into existing precollege curricula.

41. Supplementary economic education materials which provide a variety of learning experiences about economics should be designed.

42. Extensive revisions of available economic education materials should be carried out to improve their pedagogical components, their usefulness to ethnic minorities, and their classification of value considerations in economic decision making.

43. Any newly developed materials in economic education should follow the guidelines in the Joint Council on Economic Education's Master Curriculum Guide Program, the National Council for the Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines, and the curriculum work of Lawrence Senesh, Suzanne Helburn, and Hilda Taba.

44. Any newly developed materials should be carefully field-tested under controlled conditions, and the test results should be made available to users and potential users of the materials.

45. Economic educators should design and conduct careful evaluation procedures as an important part of any curriculum project.

46. Evaluation instruments with greater specificity should be used to evaluate new economic education materials. The Curriculum Materials Analysis System developed by the Social Science Education Consortium could serve as an appropriate model.

47. Professionals not previously involved in economic education curriculum development should be sought and involved in any new projects to provide fresh ideas and approaches.

48. In any curriculum development work, greater cooperation between the Joint Council on Economic Education, the American Economic Association, the Social Science Education Consortium, and the National Council for the Social Studies should be developed.

Preservice and Inservice Teacher Economic Education Training

49. Inservice teacher training programs in economic education should be expanded.

50. Inservice teacher education programs should be conducted cooperatively with economists and educators using excellent examples of economic education materials.

51. Inservice training programs should cease to be repair shops of defective teacher training programs and concentrate on giving new directions and growth to established teachers.

52. Teachers should be given special inservice training with new economic education materials to maximize the impact of those materials on student learning.

53. Teacher education programs based on achieving specifically identified teacher competencies should be developed.

54. All teacher training programs should model in their own training those principles of teaching and learning they seek to transmit.

55. All inservice and preservice teacher training programs should be systematically analyzed and the results given widespread dissemination.

56. Programs should be held to improve the economic understanding of college social studies methods teachers.

57. More cooperative working relationships should be developed between economists and teacher trainers in undergraduate economic education.

58. Each state should review and propose minimal certification and graduation requirements for teacher education in economics.

Implementation of Economic Education Curricula

59. Diffusion organizations like the Joint Council on Economic Education should concentrate their implementation programs in "early-adopter" school districts and schools. These "lighthouse" schools will lead middle- and late-adopter schools in implementing economic education programs.

60. Great effort should be made to develop and assist people playing linkage and advocate roles in curriculum development and implementation. Special training and informational meetings regarding economic education materials might be conducted with school district curriculum coordinators, assistant superintendents for curriculum, and state social studies coordinators.

Goals and Status of Precollegiate Education in Political Science and Strategies for Improving It, 1971

(from Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association, Political Education in the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science, PS, 4(3):431-457, Summer 1971)

1. Purposes of Pre-Collegiate Education in Political Science
   - a. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should transmit to students a knowledge about the "realities" of political life as well as exposing them to the cultural ideals of American democracy.
   - b. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should transmit to students a knowledge about political behavior and processes as well as knowledge about formal governmental institutions and legal structures.
   - c. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should transmit to students knowledge about political systems other than the American system, and particularly knowledge about the international system.
   - d. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should develop within students a capacity to think about political phenomena in conceptually sophisticated ways.
   - e. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should develop within students an understanding of and skill in the process of social scientific inquiry.
   - f. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should develop within students a capacity to make explicit and analyzed normative judgments about political decisions and policies.

g. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should develop within students an understanding of the social psychological sources and historical-cultural origins of their own political attitudes and values, and a capacity to critically analyze the personal and social implications of alternative values.

h. Political science education in elementary and secondary schools should develop within students an understanding of the capacities and skills needed to participate effectively and democratically in the life of the society.

2. An Appraisal of Prevailing Patterns in Pre-Collegiate Political Science Education

a. Much of current political science instruction in elementary and secondary schools transmits a naive, unrealistic and romanticized image of political life which confuses the ideals of democracy with the realities of politics.

b. On the whole, instruction about civics and government places undue stress upon historical events, legal structures and formal institutional aspects of government and fails to transmit adequate knowledge about political behaviors and processes.

c. On the whole, instruction in civics and government reflects an ethnocentric pre-occupation with American society and fails to transmit to students an adequate knowledge about the political systems of other national societies or the international system.

d. On the whole, instruction about civics and government fails to develop within students a capacity to think about political phenomena in conceptually sophisticated ways; an understanding of, and skill in the process of social scientific inquiry; or a capacity to systematically analyze political decisions and values.

e. On the whole, instruction in civics and government fails to develop within students an understanding of the capacities and skills needed to participate effectively and democratically in politics.

3. A Strategy for Improving Pre-Collegiate Political Science Education

--For the discipline to substantially effect change in political science education at the pre-collegiate level there must be developed within the profession institutional and cultural support for involvement in educational research, development and service activities.

--For the discipline to substantially effect change in political science education at the pre-collegiate level there must be developed a network of collaborative relations with other groups and institutions involved in educational reform.

--For the discipline to substantially effect change in political scinece education at the pre-collegiate level there must be developed a set of coordinated research, development and service programs aimed at both elementary and secondary education and designed to effect change in curriculum, in teacher education, and in the social organization and culture of schools.